FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-171
Wednesday
6 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-171 CONTENTS *6 September 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Plant To Destroy Chemical Weapons Scrapped *[TASS]* 1
'Favorable' Situation for Vienna Arms Talks Seen *[Levin on Moscow Radio]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 5 Sep 2
  Notes Shevardnadze-Baker Meeting *[TASS]* 2
  Previews Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting *[TASS]* 2
  Expresses Concern Over Cypriot Problem *[TASS]* 2
  Views Afghan Opposition *[TASS]* 2
  Discusses Emigration, Missing Frenchman *[Moscow Radio]* 3
  TASS Summarizes Briefing 3
Primakov Attends IPU Conference in London *[TASS]* 4
  Further on Start of Conference *[Moscow TV]* 4
Gorbachev Greets Interparliamentary Union Leaders *[PRAVDA 5 Sep]* 4
'Observers Roundtable' Views Current Events *[Agayants, Andrianov, Kornilov on Moscow Radio]* 5
'Top Priority' Program Views Baltic Situation *[Kuznetsov, Bogdanov, (Melville) on Moscow International]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Outlines Foreign Policy in TV Interview *[TASS]* 13
Medvedev Receives USIA Director *[TASS]* 13
Sununu on 'Consistent' U.S. Policy Toward Poland *[TASS]* 13
Commentary on U.S.-Soviet Summit Dialogue *[Glazunov on Moscow International]* 14
CPSU Greets U.S. Communist Party on Jubilee *[PRAVDA 1 Sep]* 14
Alaskan Delegation Visits Soviet Union 14
  Delegation Arrives in Magadan *[Moscow Radio]* 14
  Cooperation at Visit Reported *[TASS]* 15

China

Construction Begins on Railway Link to China *[TASS]* 15
PRC Ambassador Sees Prospects for Cooperation *[Moscow International]* 15
PRC Protests UN Rights Panel Decision *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Sep]* 16
Khabarovsk-Harbin Air Link Inaugurated *[TASS]* 16

Northeast Asia

Zaykov Meets DPRK Capital Delegation *[Moscow Radio]* 16
Vladivostok Proposes ROK University Exchange *[Moscow International]* 16
Mongolian Foreign Minister Stops in Moscow *[PRAVDA 4 Sep]* 17

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Delegation Leader Meets Nishanov in Moscow *[PRAVDA 4 Sep]* 17
Text of Greetings to SRV Leaders Published *[PRAVDA 2 Sep]* 17
Supreme Soviet Group Visits Melbourne Businesses *[TASS]* 17
Rogachev Receives Australian Diplomat *[TASS]* 18
Indonesia's Suharto Interviewed on Upcoming Visit *[TASS]* 18

- Opposition to U.S. Bases in Singapore Noted *[Valentinov on Moscow International]* ... 18
- Commentary Marks Malaysian National Day *[Vasilyev on Moscow International]* ... 19

Near East & South Asia

- Israeli Policy in Occupied Territories Viewed *[Babenko on TASS]* ... 19
- 'Anxiety' Toward Israel Noted *[TASS]* ... 20
- Iran's Besharati Hails Ties With USSR *[TASS]* ... 20
- 'Political Liberalization' in Iran Discussed *[Batyev on Moscow International]* ... 20
- Afghanistan Denies Presence of Soviet Advisers *[Moscow Radio]* ... 21
- 'Northern War' Between Afghan Rebels Noted *[TASS]* ... 21
- U.S. Works Out New Afghan Aid Strategy *[TASS]* ... 22
- Afghan Opposition Rejects Peace Overtures *[Shurygin on PRAVDA 31 Aug]* ... 22
- Saudi Communist Party Congress Statement Cited *[PRAVDA 2 Sep]* ... 23

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Tigray Front Attack on Ethiopian Army Viewed *[Yevgenyev on Moscow International]* ... 23
- South Africa's Foreign Contacts Examined *[Fedorov on Moscow International]* ... 24
- Somali President's Multiparty Proposal Praised *[Moscow International]* ... 25

East Europe

- SFRY's Loncar Previews Belgrade Summit *[IZVESTIYA 3 Sep]* ... 25
- Andrey Sakharov Interviewed on Hungarian TV *[Budapest TV]* ... 27
- MSZMP Leaders Explain Party's Role *[PRAVDA 31 Aug]* ... 29
- CSSR Embassy Counselor Cited on Perestroyka *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 29 Aug]* ... 30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

- Figures on Drug Abuse in USSR Reported *[Moscow International]* ... 32
- Shevardnadze Interviewed on Perestroyka *[TASS]* ... 32
- Railways Minister Discusses Problems *[Moscow TV]* ... 33
- Estonian Official Discusses USSR Relations *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 4 Sep]* ... 34
- 'Mutual Understanding' Sought in Tallinn *[Moscow TV]* ... 36
- Estonian Deputy Views Economic Reform Prospects *[Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET 1 Sep]* ... 37
- Estonian Front Aide Sees Conservative Backlash *[Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET 31 Aug]* ... 38
- Latvian Group Wants Full Political Independence *[AFP]* ... 38
- Current Mood in Latvia Described *[TRUD 5 Sep]* ... 39
- Latvian Party's Vagris on CPSU CC Statement *[Riga International]* ... 40
- Lithuanian Council Notes 'Anti-Baltic' Statement *[Vilnius International]* ... 40
- Report on Strength of Sajudis in Lithuania Noted *[Moscow TV]* ... 41
- 'Defense of Soviet Power' Group Holds Rally *[PRAVDA 5 Sep]* ... 42
- Lithuanian Trade Unions Issue Appeal for Calm *[Vilnius International]* ... 43
- Lithuanian Television News Editor Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 2 Sep]* ... 43
- Complex Situation in Baltic Republics Discussed *[Rogachev on Moscow International]* ... 44
- Zhukov Discusses Western Media as 'Provocateurs' *[PRAVDA 2 Sep]* ... 44
- Riga Fishermen Interviewed on State of Fleet *[Moscow TV]* ... 46
- Faults In Current Socialism Examined *[Vilnius LITERATURA IR MENAS No 20]* ... 47
- Disruptions, Arrests Reported in Azerbaijan *[Baku Radio]* ... 50
- Strikes Spread to Azerbaijan Refineries *[AFP]* ... 50
  - Oil Production, Transportation Affected *[TASS]* ... 50
  - Konarev Seeks Restriction on Railway Strikes *[AFP]* ... 51
- Russians in Azerbaijan Issue Appeal *[Baku Radio]* ... 52
- PRAVDA, Azerbaijan Criticized on U.S. Resolution *[Yerevan International]* ... 52
- Ukrainian Draft Law on Languages Discussed *[TASS]* ... 53
- Strikes Over Moldavian Language Law Increasing *[Moscow Radio]* ... 53
  - Committee Resolves To Continue Strike *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 5 Sep]* ... 54

- Moldavian Strikers Meet Republic Leaders *[Moscow International]* ... 54

Supreme Soviet Commission Calls for End to Strikes *[TASS]* ... 55

- Commission Begins Work in Moldavia *[Moscow TV]* ... 55
- Auyelbekov Heads Commission on Moldavia *[Moscow Radio]* ... 55

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Reviewed *[PRAVDA 3 Sep]* ... 56

Commentatary Warns of Strikes' Divisive Potential *[IZVESTIYA 1 Sep]* ... 57

Kazakh's Nazarbayev Discusses Nationality Issues *[IZVESTIYA 26 Aug]* ... 59

Uzbek Deputy Writes on Interethnic Issues *[IZVESTIYA 30 Aug]* ... 64

Prosecutor Seeks Jail Term for Former Uzbek Leader *[TASS]* ... 66

Work of AUCCTU Outlined as Plenum Opens *[Moscow Radio]* ... 66

- Role of Trade Unions Viewed *[TRUD 25 Aug]* ... 66
- Shalayev Regards Plenum Mood *[Krutov on Moscow TV]* ... 68

Vorotnikov Airs Views on Nationalities Issue ... 68

- Part 1 *[Moscow International]* ... 68
- Part 2 *[Moscow International]* ... 69
- Part 3 *[Moscow International]* ... 70

'Foreign Debut' of Supreme Soviet Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 26 Aug]* ... 71

Internal Affairs Ministry's Trushin on Crime Data *[Moscow TV]* ... 73

Moscow Party Club Aims, Structure Outlined *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 13 Aug]* ... 74

Improved Quality of CPSU Membership Urged *[PRAVDA 31 Aug]* ... 76

Zaykov Visits Moscow Schools on Knowledge Day *[Moscow Radio]* ... 77

Historian Backs Yakovlev View on German Pacts *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Sep]* ... 78

Contents of KOMMUNIST No 13 Reviewed *[PRAVDA 4 Sep]* ... 78

- Problems of State Reforms Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 79

New 'Topical Interviews' Program Described *[Moscow TV]* ... 79

Economic

Belousov Outlines Defense Industry Conversion *[PRAVDA 28 Aug]* ... 79

Management Blamed for Poor Rail Performance *[Sluzhakov in GUDOK 24 Aug]* ... 85

Agricultural

Nikonov Discusses Arrears in Saratov Oblast *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 27 Aug]* ... 86

Nikonov Talks With Rural Leaseholders *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Sep]* ... 87

Scientific

'Soyuz TM-8' Launched; Docking Set for 8 Sep ... 88

- Flight Prospects, Activities Explained *[Moscow Radio]* ... 88
- Launching Announced *[TASS]* ... 88
- Cosmonauts' Program Outlined *[TASS]* ... 89

Military

General Speaks on Perestroyka in Military Sphere *[TASS]* ... 89

New Volga-Ural Military District Created *[IZVESTIYA 5 Sep]* ... 89

SOVETSKIY VOIN To Appear in 5 Languages *[Moscow International]* ... 90

Plant To Destroy Chemical Weapons Scrapped

LD0609114189 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Text] Chapayevsk, Kuybyshev Region, September 6 TASS—The city of Chapayevsk in the Russian Federation's Kuybyshev region will not have a plant designed to destroy chemical weapons as the Soviet Government has decided to heed public requests.

Due to a complicated ecological situation in the region, the authorities made a decision to convert the nearly finished facility into a training centre to master industrial methods of eliminating toxic agents.

Ecologically harmless chemicals will be used in the process.

'Favorable' Situation for Vienna Arms Talks Seen

LD0409192289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] The third round of talks on conventional armed forces in Europe began today in Vienna's Hofburg Palace. I will ask my colleague Viktor Levin to talk about the atmosphere in which this new stage in the talks is beginning.

[Levin] After the previous, second, round the sides were fairly unanimous in noting substantial progress. It is true that one has to note that the opinions of the representatives of socialist states that make up the Warsaw Pact and of the representatives of NATO states did not coincide in every respect. For example, the British representative, Cleghorn, was convinced that the progress surpassed all expectations, while the socialist countries' view was that even more could have been achieved. Everyone agreed that the second round was a substantial step forward.

What, then, is the actual positive balance of the second round of the talks? Three points can be noted. First, whereas at the beginning of the talks it had only been noted at the general level that the initial reductions must affect those types of weapon that form the potential for sudden attack and for the conduct of large-scale offensive operations, in the course of the second round the specific types of weapon involved were clearly defined. They are aircraft, helicopters, tanks, armored fighting vehicles, artillery, and personnel.

Second, whereas in the first round the general outlines of an initial agreement took shape, its structure is now clearly defined. What is involved is that collective levels of conventional armed forces, which must be significantly lower than current ones, are being set for NATO and Warsaw Pact Organization. The problem of imbalances and asymmetries would thus be solved.

Last, the third point in the assets of the talks' second round is that two working groups, to which the center of gravity of the talks has shifted, have been set up and have started to function. It must be said that work immediately started in a very active manner in these groups.

Problems remain, of course, and there will clearly have to be considerably more discussion about them; for instance, with regard to an issue such as the inclusion of light vehicles in the total number of tanks, which NATO does not yet want. On the other hand, NATO has claims with regard to the question of cuts in land-based combat aircraft. Representatives of the NATO states consider that their number must include such systems—which are purely defensive in our opinion—as air-defense interceptor fighters, which are incapable of delivering strikes against ground targets. There are also disputes over the problem of personnel. According to the NATO concept, the two powers' troops which are located outside their national territories—the troops of the USSR and the United States—must be subject to reduction to equal levels. Yet, after all, there are also other foreign troops on the FRG's territory: British, French, Belgian, and Canadian, totalling over 100,000 men. How can they really be ignored?

At the very last moment in the second round's work, NATO made new proposals. This was a gratifying moment, since this created work already in hand, as it were, for the third round of talks. Moreover, it must be noted that the original plan was for NATO to submit these proposals at the very start of the third round's work. By submitting them earlier, the member-states of the Warsaw Pact Organization have an opportunity to carefully study the proposals in the course of the 2-month pause between the second and third rounds.

In short, the third round is starting up in favorable circumstances, and it can be hoped that another important step forward will be made at it.

Perfilyev Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 5 Sep

Notes Shevardnadze-Baker Meeting

LD0509134189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1256 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 Sep (TASS)—The meeting between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, which is planned for 22-23 September, will take place in the U.S. State of Wyoming, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Information Administration, announced at a briefing today.

"This will be a regular, full-scale meeting which will cover the entire complex of Soviet-U.S. relations," the USSR Foreign Ministry representative said. "In particular, disarmament issues and regional, bilateral, transnational, and humanitarian problems will be discussed. Some aspects of economic ties will also be examined."

Questions connected with a future Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will also be discussed at the meeting in the State of Wyoming, Vadim Perfilyev said.

Previews Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting

LD0509134689 Moscow TASS in English 1327 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—"The Soviet side is prepared for a serious and constructive dialogue with Great Britain and is convinced that the new summit meeting will be just as productive as all the previous ones", Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, stated at a briefing here today. In connection with the brief working meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime-Minister Margaret Thatcher, which is to take place on September 23rd when the British premier will make a short stopover in Moscow en route from Tokyo to London, the Soviet diplomat said: "Although less than five months have passed since Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to London last April, the period was packed with major events both of European and world dimension. In view of this the leaders of the two countries wish to check political clocks, to compare their evaluations".

Speaking of the forthcoming Soviet-British summit meeting's agenda, the Foreign Ministry spokesman pointed out that it will not "sidestep such major questions as East-West relations, disarmament problems, European and regional security, Europe's development". He did not answer the question put by a REUTER correspondent, who wished to know on the initiative of which side the meeting would be held.

Expresses Concern Over Cypriot Problem

LD0509142089 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—The Soviet Union is concerned over new complications that have arisen recently in a search for ways of settling the Cypriot problem, a Soviet spokesman told the news briefing today.

Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, has said that the Cypriot talks, held under the UN aegis, revealed different approaches of the sides to the procedural formula of what he called the outlines of a comprehensive Cypriot settlement, proposed by the U.N. secretary general. The leadership of the so-called Turkish Republic of northern Cyprus refuses to discuss the idea of the U.N. secretary general as a working basis for intercommunal dialogue, hampering its continuation.

The position of the Turkish Cypriot leadership practically calls to question the procedure of realisation of the mandate agreed by the sides and the U.N. secretary general, including by offering the sides ideas and considerations, in one form or another, which take into account positions which they put forward earlier or have coordinated at the talks.

"We negatively approach any actions complicating the intercommunal dialogue and hope that, with UN assistance, the interested sides will find a way out of the situation in the spirit of responsibility and that the intercommunal talks will be resumed," Perfilyev said.

He pledged consistent support to the efforts of Perez de Cuellar on Cyprus, taken as part the good offices mission entrusted to him by the U.N. Security Council.

Views Afghan Opposition

LD0509163189 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—The utter ineffectiveness of Afghanistan's "transitional government", which tries to achieve if only a semblance of unity within the opposition becomes ever more apparent, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Summing up the situation in the Afghan armed opposition, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, pointed out that the "northern war" between units of the Islamic Party and of the Islamic Society is constantly causing loss of life. More Afghans are killed during combat operations of the "northern war" than in battles of the government army against rebels.

The Soviet diplomat noted that numerous units of rebels become disappointed in the ability of their leaders to ensure peaceful life in the country and go over to the government's side. Thus, a unit of 290 people went over to the government's side in Herat Province. Numerous small units of the Islamic Party, not wishing to come under fire during "northern war", also go over to the side of the government or of the Islamic Society.

"Clashes between the Islamic Party and the Islamic Society are noticed also in Pakistan and the supporters of the Islamic Society protest not only against the war that Gulbuddin Hekmatyar unleashed against the Islamic Society, but also against Hekmatyar's Pushtoon nationalism and striving to oppress national minorities", Perfilyev said. "Hekmatyar's Pushtoon nationalism annoys other leaders of the seven, among them Mojaddedi, rabbani and Guailani who believe that he undermines the positions of the Alliance of Seven among Afghanistan's Shi'ites and Dari-speaking population".

The "northern war" showed patently that the United States, Pakistan and Saudi Arabia banked on the cruelest, most unpredictable and unpopular leader of the seven, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said. The "transitional government" of Afghanistan formed in Pakistan has been unable to achieve unity with the "Alliance of Eight". It has compromised itself by causing heavy civilian casualties during the shelling of residential quarters of cities, and now claims to represent the Afghan people in the Non-aligned Movement. The "political platform" of that "government", so to say, has nothing in common with the goals and tasks of the Non-aligned Movement, Perfilyev said.

Discusses Emigration, Missing Frenchman

LD0609103789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Text] At a regular briefing at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center, Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Information Administration, after discussing certain events in international life, answered questions from journalists.

[Begin Perfilyev recording] A correspondent from the Dutch TELEGRAAF newspaper asked about statistics concerning the emigration of Soviet citizens for permanent residence abroad.

The total number of citizens who have received permission to emigrate to permanent residence abroad was 108,000 in 1988. Of that number, 30,000 received permission to emigrate to Israel. Last year 51,000 Soviet citizens received permission to emigrate to the FRG. The number of people, including children under the age of majority, who received permission to emigrate to the United States over the same period is over 17,000.

In analyzing these figures, one should bear in mind that, in our country, emigration, and therefore the statistics, are conducted not by nationality, but by destination; in other words, Israel, the FRG, the United States, and other countries. This data is regularly cited here, and you can find it in issues of VESTNIK MIDA SSSR [BULLETIN OF THE USSR FOREIGN MINISTRY].

A question was also asked about Basmajian, a French medical orderly who disappared in Moscow some time ago. As we were informed by the Main Administration of Internal Affairs of the Moscow City Executive Committee, the search for the French citizen is continuing. In the interests of the search, it would now seem inexpedient to provide any kind of additional information on this matter. [end recording]

TASS Summarizes Briefing

LD0509185389 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—The Soviet side is prepared for a serious and constructive dialogue with Britain and is convinced that the new summit meeting will be just as productive as all the previous ones, Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, stated at a briefing here today. In connection with the brief working meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, which is to take place on September 23rd, the Soviet diplomat said that it would focus on such major questions as East-West relations, disarmament problems, European and regional security, Europe's development.

Perfilyev also said that Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will meet U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming, on September 22-23.

This will be a new large-sclae meeting which will cover the whole range of Soviet-American relations, including disarmament, regional, bilateral, transnational and humanitarian problems. Issues connected with the future Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will also be discussed, the Soviet spokesman said.

The Soviet Union is concerned over new complications that have arisen recently in a search for ways of settling the Cypriot problem, which is connected with the non-constructive stand of the Turkish-Cypriot leadership which refuses to discuss the ideas of the U.N. secretary-general as a working basis for intercommunal dialogue. He expressed the hope that with U.N. assistance the interested sides will find a way out of the situation and that intercommunal talks will continue.

Speaking about the situation in the camp of the Afghan armed opposition, Perfilyev said that the recent events show utter ineffectiveness of Afghanistan's "transitional government" which tries to achieve if only a semblance of unity within the opposition. In particular, this is evidenced by the so-called "northern war" between units of the Islamic Party and Islamic Society which causes more deaths than battles between the rebels and the government army.

Perfilyev also replied to question asked by journalists at previous briefings. In particular, he said that the total number of Soviet citizens who had received permission to leave the USSR for permanent residence abroad in 1988 was more than 108,000 people, of them 30,000 were those with permission to leave for Israel. As regards West Germany and the United States these figures were 51,000 and 17,000 respectively.

Perfilyev denied as inconsistent allegations by former Finnish political leader Ahti Karjalainen who said that a representative of the Soviet Embassy interfered in the course of presidential elections in Finland in 1981-82. The Soviet diplomat said, in particular, that "interfering in the internal affairs of other states is inconsistent with Soviet policy."

Asked about French art dealer Garrik Basmajian, who recently disappeared in Moscow, Perfilyev said a search continued. "It does not seem appropriate to give any additional information on this issue at present," Perfilyev added.

The briefing was also addressed by Yuriy Reshetov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's department for humanitarian cooperation and human rights. Reshetov told about the results of the annual sessions of the U.N. bodies—the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the Commission on Human Rights, which have just ended in Geneva.

Primakov Attends IPU Conference in London

LD0409200189 Moscow TASS in English 1858 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Excerpts] London September 4 TASS—By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Voskoboinikov:

London's usually drab centre has been prettied up—dozens of multi-coloured national flags are flapping in the wind in the Parliamentary Square and the Houses of Parliament themselves, with crowds of tourists at the gates, look special for the occasion: The Westminister Hall is the venue today of the 82nd conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, an influential international organisation whose centenary is marked this year.

The jubilee session is attended by parliamentary groups from more than 100 countries, including the Soviet Union. The Soviet delegation is headed by Chairman of the Council of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet Yevgeniy Primakov. [passage omitted]

Incidentally, members of the Soviet delegation who arrived in London on August 31, joined in the work straight away: They participated in the session of the meetings of the Inter-Parliamentary Union Executive Committee and held some business talks. On Sunday, V. Matvienko attended a session of the group of women parliamentarians. [passage omitted]

Further on Start of Conference

LD0509083289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The 82d conference of the Interparliamentary Union opened in the British capital today. [passage ommitted]

[Begin video recording of ceremony. Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet and head of the Soviet delegation] We have already discussed in the executive committee the issue of amending the charter. It appears that this clause will be adopted, and it will be not a club of parliamentarians but a union of the parliaments of various countries. The whole session will be devoted to vitally important issues, including space. I think that the issue of arms reduction and the need for parliaments to take a greater part in this activity will be raised in earnest here. Of course, issues relating to cooperation between parliaments of various countries will be examined.

The message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that has been received here is of great importance. The message is very substantive. By the main thing is the fact of a message from head of the Soviet state. This is very good. A great deal is being said about this here. It met with a considerable and favorable response, including from the British organizers of the conference, because they understand that this is also, to an extent, a step toward Britain. [end recording]

Gorbachev Greets Interparliamentary Union Leaders

PM0509151089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Greetings message from President Mikhail Gorbachev to Interparliamentary Union leaders Daouda Sow and Pierre Cornillon on the occasion of the Interparliamentary Union centennial]

[Text] To Mr Daouda Sow, chairman of the Interparliamentary Union [IPU];
To Mr Pierre Cornillon, secretary general of the IPU.

Esteemed gentlemen:
On the centennial of the IPU, I greet all participants in the jubilee 82d conference. The IPU's rich history and multifaceted present-day activity are evidence that the union, pursuing the goals proclaimed in its charter, helps to strengthen international peace and cooperation.

Multilateral interparliamentary dialogue on the urgent problems of world development is gaining particular significance today, now that the new political thinking is beginning to become established in international affairs. Joint efforts by the parliamentarians of different countries could promote the more dynamic renewal of international relations, their democratization and humanization, and the establishment of the paramountcy of common human values in states' foreign policies.

Consistently pursuing the implementation of these goals in practice and the creation of a nuclear-free, nonviolent world, the Soviet state advocates the enhancement of the role and effectiveness of the IPU in the cause of pooling the efforts of different countries' parliamentarians irrespective of their ideological convictions and political orientation, in the interests of the development of trust and all-around cooperation in the world and for the sake of mankind's survival and progress.

I wish your conference success.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

'Observers Roundtable' Views Current Events

LD0309191489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 3 Sep 89

["International Observers Roundtable" program with host Nikolay Agayants; Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator; and Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov, TASS political observer]

[Text] [Agayants] Hello there, esteemed listeners. Taking part in our meeting today are my colleague Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, foreign political commentator for All-Union Radio, and TASS political observer Yuriy Emmanuilovich Kornilov.

Half a century ago, the Second World War began with the attack on Poland by Hitlerite Germany. The most destructive and bloody war in the history of mankind, it cost more than 50 million lives, leaving an ineradicable wound in people's hearts and memories. Fascism failed to reverse the march of history. Faced by a common danger, the countries and peoples that valued freedom and democracy managed to join forces. The emergence of the anti-Hitler coalition demonstrated how beneficial are the fruits when the trend towards cooperation and the collective defense of peace gains the upper hand. So wrote PRAVDA in its 1 September issue. A very important and equivocal [as heard] lesson is derived from this. Through joint actions by all those who hold progress and freedom dear, the forces of evil and violence can be curbed.

[Andrianov] It is evident that this conclusion has enormous significance in our time. After all, never before has the integrality, interdependence, and fragility of the world around us been felt so obviously and clearly. The greatest threat to mankind today is undoubtedly nuclear war. That is why our program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 has met with a wide response and support among people of good will—because it meets the vital interests of all denizens of planet earth. Surely peoples and states cannot cope on their own with the most acute ecological problems that face mankind?

[Kornilov] I think one must particularly stress here the qualitatively new approaches to foreign policy in the period of restructuring, which find expression in the search for new ways of constructing present-day international relations. Gradually, step by step, relations among states are being cleared of the dogmas and stereotypes of the past and of the sentiments of the cold war of ill renown. And increasingly, in a more and more active way, a new political thinking, enabling the most reliable path in the labyrinth of the most complex problems of the present day to be sought and found, is being put into place. Thus, the cause of averting a thermo-nuclear catastrophe and of preserving and consolidating peace has now become the vital cause of the majority of the world's population.

[Agayants] But, for all the positive improvements, there are no grounds for complacency. The trouble is that the trend towards disarmament that has taken shape has not yet become irreversible, and the desire for dialogue and cooperation has not yet taken firm root in the practice of international relations. Bellicose circles in the United States and some other countries of the North Atlantic bloc continue to build up their production of the latest types of armaments.

[Andrianov] I think it is all the more obvious that a dictate of our time is to learn the proper lessons from the last world war. It is an unalterable fact that an increase in energetic action to further ease international tension is required from all countries and all realistically minded forces.

[Kornilov] Yes, the door to nuclear-free and non-violent world must finally be thrown open to mankind.

[Agayants] We are absolutely right to link the changes taking place in international relations with the affirmation of the new political thinking created by the restructuring processes in our country. And one is bound to say that restructuring is being observed in many countries sympathetically and—this is no exaggeration—with hope, for all the difficulties and restructuring may be confronting and for all the negative outbursts and excesses in political and economic life that may accompany it. As confirmation of this, one could cite the reaction of foreign news media and world public opinion to recent events and the CPSU Central Committee statement on the Soviet Baltic republics. It is a telling fact that the tone of these statements is, in the main, restrained and proper.

[Andrianov] If you take the Austrian press, for example, the first articles, with headlines tinged with sensationalism such as "Sharp Warning to Separatists," "Reproaches From Moscow," and so on, have given way to serious analysis of the events in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Vienna's DIE PRESSE for instance, which reflects the views of Austrian industrial circles, focuses attention in a front-paged comment on the following passage in the document: "People must know what abyss the nationalist leaders are pushing them towards." The STANDARD, a popular newspaper among representatives of business circles and a considerable proportion of the republic's intelligentsia, carried its material under the banner headline, "Central Committee Criticizes Nationalism."

[Kornilov] Many French papers are covering these events in roughly the same spirit. Even LE FIGARO, known for its sharp, not always objective, assessments of our situation, adheres in the main to a calm and considered tone, while tending to distort the facts.

[Agayants] This—I must admit—somewhat unexpected restraint on the part of many Western news media in their commentaries on the events in the Soviet Baltic region today can be attributed, it seems to me, to the fact that neither the U.S. leadership, nor the leadership of other NATO countries, apparently intend to openly support the protests of the Baltic nationalists, out of fear of destabilizing the situation in Europe.

[Andrianov] That is exactly the case, NIkolay Ivanovich. At any rate, an editorial article published in the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE, a newspaper that comes out in English in Paris, is very eloquent in this respect. It says, in particular: "The Balts have frequently met with reproof in the West from precisely those whose sympathy they would appear to be able to count on. The issue of their independence has nver been a priority on the international agenda, and they have had to reconcile themselves to the painful reminder that they themselves flirted with Hitler, something that Moscow too is now reminding them about. Their political aspirations have on the whole been perceived as a destabilizing and unrealistic threat to the status quo which does not contribute to the greater good or universal peace. The description of them as enslaved nations has been perceived by many of us as an excessive dramatization of the situation by right-wing emigres," the newspaper stresses. That is the kind of thing I mean.

[Kornilov] I would like to add, Boris Vasilyevich, that the same INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE notes that despite the peaceful and democratic character of the protests in the Soviet Baltic republics, it writes, many in the West today are alarmed that, I quote again, "the separatist groups are obviously aiming to redraw the political map of postwar Europe."

[Agayants] People ask: What will happen in the future? Do all Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians really think in the same way as the extremists in these repubics? Will the Baltic peoples follow the separatist slogans of the political speculators, whose leading program is anti-Sovietism? That is how the newspaper RUDE PRAVO, organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia Central Committee, raises the question, when expressing concern in connection with the events in the Baltic republics. In a situation when the Baltic republics are among the first to have the possibility to develop regional financial autonomy and to prove its advantages, when the nationalities policy platform offered for discussion has opened a wide program of practical realization of Lenin's ideas in building Soviet federalism, when the country most needs constructive work, anti-perestroyka forces in the Baltic republics do everything possible in order to distract people from such work: They inflame passions, they recall bygone falsehood and injustice, RUDE PRAVO writes.

[Andrianov] The necessity to consolidate all the forces in the name of perestroyka and the implementation of the economic and political reform, not for the sake of putting spokes in someone's wheels, is discussed in the comments of the newspapers, radio, and television of other socialist countries too. Here is the opinion of Tamara Kruchkovskaya, deputy editor in chief of POLSHA [Poland] magazine. One can speak of priorities, she writes, of the degree of independence, of the financial autonomy of the republic; however, there should be a limit to the demands, because the improvement of life in itself depends today to a greater extent on the individual's own useful participation in it. In a word, however difficult the situation in the Baltic republics turns out, it is possible and necessary to search for the solution of all problems only from positions of realism and reason. That is what the well- known CPSU Central Committee statement is appealing for.

[Agayants] Lately, many political figures and press organs have asked themselves: How will the irreconcilable opposition answer the new peace proposals presented by Najibullah, president of Afghanistan, on 19 August? Today we know the answer. The initiatives of Kabul are repudiated by the armed Afghan, to be more precise anti-Afghan, opposition based in Pakistan. The fratricidal war in Afghanistan continues.

The very fact that the rebel leaders turned down the appeal from Kabul to cease the bloodshed should, perhaps, not surprise us. Not for nothing do even many organs of the foreign mass media, when talking of the Afghan armed opposition, dub it "irreconcilable"—just that. I believe the important point lies elsewhere: However extremist and irreconcilable may be that section of the opposition that still cannot shake off the illusion that it has a chance of usurping power in this sovereign country, that opposition could not function so aggressively were it not able to rely on support from abroad.

[Kornilov] Of course not! And now, all these months after the signing of the Geneva accords in April 1988, the guardians and protectors of this opposition flout the undertakings of the Geneva package and shower it with money, arms, and all it needs for its terrorist actions and to continue fighting.

[Agayants] That is the whole point. And consequently, in their rejection of Kabul's peace initiatives, the rebels have, of course, expressed and reflected the stance of their patrons and protectors in Islamabad and Washington.

[Andrianov] I do not think there can be any doubt of that. Only I would add Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia, to your list.

[Kornilov] Meanwhile, every so often loud-mouthed statements emanate from all these capitals—but perhaps particularly from Washington. The originators of these—and there are some very highly placed people among them—speak of their commitment to the cause of peaceful political settlement, of their respect for the Afghan people's right to choose, and of how important it is for peace in Asia to stick to the spirit and the letter of the Geneva accords.

[Agayants] Well, what can I say? It is well known that the actual policy of any state finds expression not in the utterances of the state's leaders, but in their practical and specific actions.

[Kornilov] But, Nikolay Ivanovich, in this instance the gulf between the words and the actual deeds is especially pronounced. It is particuarly striking.

[Agayants] The opponents of settlement have one objection: Kabul's proposals are aimed at restoring peace, while they continue to rely on force and on interference in pursuit of their own regional ambitions and mercenary schemes.

[Andrianov] In the light of present developments in and around Afghanistan, the question really does arise as to what the leaders of the United States and Pakistan actually understand by political settlement. Is it national reconciliation, or attempts by hook or by crook to remove the legitimate government of the Republic from power? A halt to the bloodshed, or more and more rocket attacks on peaceful Afghan towns?

[Kornilov] Nowadays the stance of those who continue to pin their hopes on force seems not merely provocative, but indeed totally unrealistic and hopeless. This is something the Western press itself has been saying ever more frequently and ever more franky. Here is an excerpt from the British INDEPENDENT newspaper: The Afghan resistance, which comprises dozens of parties and several ethnic groups at odds with one another, is not in any position to unite its fighters for an all-out offensive, or even to coordinate its attacks in separate regions. The mujahidin are too divided and disorganized to carry through their ambitious strategic schemes.

[Agayants] Those conclusions sound all the more convincing when one considers just how widespread the internecine dissent and strife has recently become in the ranks of the opposition. When they see what is happening, the rebels' foreign advisers are coming to realize with dismay that the edifice of the interim government that they had spent so long building up is in danger of being destroyed, the U.S. magazine NEWSWEEK states. Recent events could mean that all attempts to repair it could prove futile. In short, today there is no doubt about the deep rift and the genuine—and, moreover grave—internal crisis in the opposition, indications of which were spotted long ago by many objective observers.

[Andrianov] In my opinion, there is another important point: A number of opposition groups in several northern, northwestern, western, and central areas of the country have halted their military action and have expressed readiness to participate in the work of the local coalition bodies of power. The leaders of many opposition formations have begun and are continuing negotiations with the authorities, and some of them have already decided to join the process of national reconciliation.

[Kornilov] Quite right, and if the truth be known, the surprising thing is how and why it has taken some Western observers and organs of the free Western press so long to acknowledge those trends in the development of the situation in and around Afghanistan that have long been apparent—and very clearly so. Let us just consider what has been notable about the 6 months that have elapsed since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. Even though the irreconcilables have not for a single day ceased their armed attacks on the republic and have not only not scored a single military victory of any note, but to the contrary have suffered defeat at Jalalabad and, in the past few days, at Khowst, as is clear from reports that are coming in. On the other hand, it is today clear to all that for all the complexity of the situation, the republic's government is today a cohesive political force capable of managing the affairs of state and defending the country. In light of what has been said, one can state quite categorically that the Afghan leadership's readiness to compromise demonstrates not its weakness, but rather its strength, and its high degree of responsibility before the people in its desire to restore peace and tranquility to Afghanistan as quickly as possible.

[Agayants] What conclusion have you reached, Yuriy Emmanuilovich?

[Kornilov] If, of course, we take the existing realities, then the conclusion is obvious: The calls for war to a victorious conclusion that even today issue from the headquarters of the armed opposition in Peshawar are dangerous and futile—and not for the opposition alone, but also for those who back it. It is particularly appropriate to mention this again now, when President Najibullah's proposals, opening up as they do fresh and extensive opportunities for a way out of the conflict, allow for an Afghan settlement to be channelled into genuine and practical actions—provided, of course, that all parties involved in the conflict have the political will.

[Agayants] But will this opportunity be seized by those who, until now, have only appeared in the unseemly role of protectors of the irreconcilables? In the role of violators of the undertakings of the Geneva package?

[Andrianov] It is to be hoped that common sense and responsibility will prevail in the long run.

[Agayants] And for the time being?

[Andrianov] For the time being, as you can see, the teletype machine in our editorial office has delivered another alarming report from Kabul: Rebel-launched cluster rockets are again raining down on the Afghan capital.

[Agayants] You are aware of the significance attached by the world public to eliminating regional conflicts. That is why many countries have been following the Paris international conference on Cambodia with such attentiveness—I might even say hope. It began on 30 July, and there was generally some justified hope for a favorable outcome. The informal meeting in Jakarta; the talks between Hun Sen, chairman of Cambodia's Council of Ministers, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk; the talks among the world's leading countries; and the contacts within the Nonaligned Movement—all of this testified to the fact that the process leading toward a Cambodian settlement had become reality. And what a good opportunity to work out a compromise solution was offered by the Paris forum itself! For it convened after the precise schedule had been announced for the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia by 27 September.

[Andrianov] There were several other favorable indicators, not least the proposal by the Cambodian state to set up in the interim period a higher guidance council with extensive powers to organize a general election. It was proposed that Prince Norodom Sihanouk head this body. In my opinion, of no small importance was the fact that Phnom Penh received a UN fact-finding mission, which then offered its observations to the participants at the Paris conference.

[Kornilov] There were other opportunities, too, that gave rise to the hope of tangible success for the forum. Therefore the world public expected that constructive ways to eliminate the conflict would be found in Paris. But naturally, for this to occur a compromise had to be reached among the main protagonists at the conference—the four Cambodian sides. Unfortunately, this was not achieved and the conference was forced to break off its work in the middle of the week, because so far it has proven impossible to agree on a number of fundamental issues relating to a Cambodian settlement, first and foremost on internal aspects.

[Agayants] One might, I think, express regret over this, but to my mind it is more useful to analyze why the Paris forum did not produce the result that many were counting on. If one turns to what has been said by western observers and the mass news media in the capitalist countries, one cannot fail to note how united they are in their assessments. In their view the conference ran into resistance right from the start from the Pol Pot group—the so-called Khmer Rouge.

[Andrianov] But after all, the international reputation of the Khmer Rouge is highly unflattering, to put it mildly. They left bad memories of their rule in Cambodia from 1975 to 1979. It was in that period that they pursued a policy of genocide; that is to say, they engaged in the deliberate and mass extermination of the population. During the period of the Pol Pot regime almost 3 million Cambodians were annihilated, while an even greater number of victims was planned. It is not surprising that at the time the bourgeois press called Cambodia a gigantic 20th century death camp.

[Kornilov] The coalition of three opposition groups feels that the so-called Khmer Rouge should be represented on an equal footing in a transitional government, which they proposed be formed from figures in the three opposition factions and the present Government of Cambodia. Moreover they propose that this be done immediately after the withdrawal of Vietnamese forces, that is to say, at the end of the month. This position is defended too by Prince Nordom Sihanouk. He justifies it be claiming that the so-called Khmer Rouge are less dangerous as allies than as enemies.

[Agayants] But this same Sihanouk, according to Thailand's BANGKOK POST, has called the Khmer Rouge burdensome allies and has expressed his certainty that they will create obstacles to a settlement. There is a clear difference in these assessments of the Pol Pot group. Or take what was said by Sihanouk's ambassador extraordinary Khek Sysoda, who said: At present the Khmer Rouge are inevitably our allies. However, he immediately added that it is possible that in the future they will become enemies.

[Andrianov] These judgements smack of either political naivety, short-term expediency, or simply a reluctance to soberly assess the real state of things. Indeed, what is the value, for instance, of the statement by (Khieu Putkhramsey), a member of Sihanouk's delegation, who said the following: We know that the Khmer Rouge are a problem; however, let the Cambodian people themselves reject them at the general election. Even the Pol Pot group realizes that elections hold no attractions for them. Indeed, they are aware what a black remembrance they have left in the country, where practically all Cambodians hate them. Therefore one must assume that these so-called Khmer Rouge realize that they do not have any realistic chances of acquiring a prominent position in the political life of Cambodia from a nationwide election.

[Kornilov] Of course they realize the situation. They know that there is no reason to hope for victory, if they lay down their arms and, together with all the groups, participate in elections. For this reason they do not intend to disarm, and are banking on military force in order to get their way. It is not for nothing that the Pol Pot group plainly strove to drive the Paris conference to an impasse, so that afterwards, as one of them said, relations could be sorted out on the battlefield. They undertook a whole series of maneuvers to foil the possible adoption of an all-embracing agreement on a settlement, and in fact wrecked the forum.

[Agayants] Yes, they fully endeavored to do that. At first they demanded that the word genocide not be used in a single forum document, and in this regard, I think, they were heartened by the positions of the representatives of China and Singapore, who claimed that there is no juridical basis for declaring that the actions of the Pol Pot regime were a policy of genocide. This interpretation suits the Khmer Rouge very well, claiming as they do that they are not butchers and that they did not exterminate their own people. It claims that they are being accused unjustifiably, and, if there was no genocide, it turns out in the Pol Pot group's view that the Cambodian people allegedly had no need of assistance from Vietnam, which sent its volunteer units into Cambodia and thereby committed an act of aggression against that country. Therefore it turns out, allegedly, that the Vietnamese servicemen were not saviors, but nothing other than aggressors and occupiers. This is how they are attempting to turn obvious facts inside out.

[Andrianov] They are making the attempt, but they are not completely succeeding. The charge of genocide against the Pol Pot group did not come out of thin air. It is based on Article 2 of the international convention condemning genocide and providing for the punishment of those who perpetrate it. That is the first point. Second, the Paris conference adopted a document on working procedure, for which, incidentally, the heads of the delegations taking part in the forum voted. This document provided for the creation of a commission which would address the problem of how to prevent a return to the policy of genocide and place obstacles in the way of such a policy. After all, if such a problem had not existed, there would have been no reason for the commission. Once it is officially recognized that such a problem does exist, it means that there is danger of a return to the policy of genocide on which the Khmer Rouge were engaged, although they now endeavor in every way to wriggle out of this.

[Kornilov] They will scarcely succeed. Memories of the evil deeds of the Pol Pot group even now evoke acute pain in the hearts of the present generation of Cambodians. Therefore, as Hun Sen stated, the state of Cambodia will never agree with those who collaborate with the Pol Pot group or support their policy of genocide. This position is totally logical and consistent. It stems from the acknowledgement at most of the informal meetings in Jakarta that there are two inseparably linked key points in the process of a settlement of the conflict—namely, the withdrawal of foreign forces from Cambodia, and, simultaneously, the adoption of measures to prevent the Pol Pot group unleashing civil war and restoring their regime. If these two points are not fulfilled, an all-embracing solution of the problem will remain in doubt. As we have already said, the Paris conference did not manage to achieve such a solution, and the blame for this lies fully with the Pol Pot group, and, naturally, those who support them.

[Agayants] Assessments of the results of the Paris forum have been, judging by the reaction abroad, highly contradictory and by no means uniform. Some are inclined to think that the conference failed, while others feel that it acquired a basis for a continuation of its work. After all, an interval in its work does not at all mean that the conference on Cambodia has reached a deadlock. There is no need to dramatize the situation. A great amount of work has been accomplished and a fine basis has been created for a whole number of comprehensive agreements. The forum revealed a commom awareness of the need to solve the Cambodian problem by political means. The task now is to continue the process begun in Jakarta, and it must develop on three levels—first, the Cambodian sides need to find means of bringing their positions closer together; second, the countries of the southeast Asian region must be active; and finally, the great powers must have their say and in every way facilitate the quest for a political settlement of the Cambodian problem. This co-ordinated triple unity will help progress toward eliminating one of the chronic regional conflicts.

Here we come to the end of our roundtable gathering. All its participants thank you for your attention, esteemed listeners. All the best till we meet again!

'Top Priority' Program Views Baltic Situation

LD0209182789 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 1 Sep 89

["Top Priority" program, hosted by Pavel Kuznetsov with guests Radomir Bogdanov and (Andrey Melville]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen? Welcome to "Top Priority" with Radomir Bogdanov and (Andrey Melville). I'm Pavel Kuznetsov, your host.

The turmoil which has engulfed the Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—and also Moldavia in the south—continues to be headline news. What has begun as a movement, as a drive for more economic autonomy and independence, has spilled into the political area, and we now clearly have a demand coming from certain elements, certain forces in those republics for secession, for complete political independence, for breaking away with the Soviet Union.

I've just come back from the United States where the mass media and officials have watched these events with keen interest and concern. One of those concerns is that further destabilization of the internal situation in the Soviet Union may have unpredictable, may have very dire consequences. On Saturday the 26th, the Central Committee of the Communist Party made a statement which has become, in my view and in the view of many Western analysts, a subject of controversy seen as both an angry backlash coming from the Moscow leadership. And we now know that the wording, the language of that statement was approved by Mikhail Gorbachev and other members of the Politburo. On the other hand it's viewed as a realistic assessment, a very realistic evaluation, a sober, if you wish, evaluation of the current situation which is becoming critical.

Now, I would like one of you to begin with giving his point of view, sharing his view, on that statement—whether it was timely, whether it was well done, whether it was perhaps too harsh. It contains such things as....

[Bogdanov] Do you, do you mean to ask our assessment of that statement?

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, whether it's....

[Bogdanov] First of all, first of all I would like....

[Kuznetsov] Like, take this, take this line in the statement which says that there maybe a possibility some time in the future where civil disobedience, and then perhaps civil war could be sparked off...so this is very strong language. (?Would you agree with that)?

[Bogdanov] Yes, this is, this is a very strong language. But I have another point: I believe that that statement could have been made much, much earlier than they did. I'm afraid it's too late. What do I mean by too late? I mean that all these popular fronts, movements, in all the three republics, are so much ahead in their, not only conceptual thinking—what to do—but in their actual (?planning). I'm sorry, but I would like to be quite frank. My feeling is that they have already crossed the line, they have crossed the point of no return [words indistinct]

[Kuznetsov] We're talking about the...some of the leaders of the popular fronts, but there is the population.

[Bogdanov] Population—look, this is a very interesting problem. Now, you have, you have this big discussion: Who is what in these republics? You have official authorities like Communist Party....

[Kuznetsov] And government leaders, yes.

[Bogdanov] And government leaders. At the same time you have popular fronts and you have a number of small parties, organizations and things like (?that).

[Kuznetsov] Representing one ethnic [words indistinct].

[Bogdanov] [words indistinct] My question to you, to anybody else: who are the real power in these republics? And you have a number of answers. And the common answer is that the real power is the Communist Party and the popular front. They are so much together, they are so much interlinked, that that is the real [words indistinct]

[Kuznetsov] Incidentally, this is another matter of concern to some people here when Communist Party leaders in those republics take the side of those popular front leaders and seem to be losing control over the events. Would you agree with that or perhaps is it done as something politically expedient for this particular moment, or do they also plan far ahead?

[(Melville)] Well now, it seems to me that dealing with this very difficult and tough issue in the Baltic republics, it seems to me we have to have in mind the fact that politics is not only the art of the possible, but also the game and the art of the game. And, what has been done right now in the Baltics should not be regarded as something which goes under, of control as Professor Bogdanov suggested. I think there is also the element of trying to push the center, to push Moscow, if not into the corner but just to influence the decisions which are going to be made in Moscow. So, I wouldn't take everything what is said in the Baltics by face value.

[Kuznetsov] [Words indistinct] It's something different. And then, one other point of a more, I would say, conceptual or theoretical character: you see in the past we regarded the crisis in which the Soviet Union had found itself at the end of the period as we say stagnation, and at the very beginning of the period of perestroyka, as the period of crisis which calls for reform. Now, there are attempts to reform this society, to change the society, and we with all our hopes and good wishes, and I would say illusions, expected that you push the button, you call for the reform and here it comes and we live in a totally different world. But, today, I think, what we're experiencing, experiencing, is the fact of political history and political theory, and merely the fact that the transition from totalitarian to authoritarian and then to democratic regime goes through crisis. And sometimes not simply the crisis provokes reforms but sometimes reforms provoke crisis. And this is the regime of perestroyka: crisis is our fate, I mean for the foreseeable future.

[Kuznetsov] I think that's....

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Do you mean a crisis of internal nature or do you mean a state crisis? What do you mean by that? Because what worries me, I'm not worried about the internal crisis and I quite agree with you this is what we have to pass through now, but what about our state situation? Are we going to be (?break out) or, what's going to happen to us? That's my question.

[Kuznetsov] Radomir, okay, we'll come to it later on in the program: I hope so. In my view, I think we have a web of contradictions stemming from the fact that 1 September being, as you know, the anniversary of World War II, there are some bitter feelings in the Baltic republics about their past. They think that a good deal of injustice was done to them by Stalin. They steadfastly cling to the view that their republics were annexed as part of the deal, Stalin's deal with Hitler. Now, another thing is that which helps, I think, this drive for secession, or breaking away from the Soviet Union, we have this Constitution, this clause, this provision in the Constitution which guarantees the right to every republic to break away, to become politically independent. And also I think that you were quite right in saying that perestroyka has changed the soviet Union radically, but not to the point when every republic would feel, would come to the conclusion that, well the time has come when we are totally independent, when we can run our affairs ourselves without any outside centralized interference, but those processes are so slow that perhaps they're trying to accelerate them.

[Bogdanov] We should not forget for a while that we are living in a real world, a world which is around us. We are not living in a vacuum. So, if you look at that from that point of view you will have some, some rather funny feelings about what may happen to Baltic states. I mean, if tomorrow you wake up and Litva [Lithuania] becomes an independent republic and quite...

[Kuznetsov] You mean an independent state?

[Bogdanov] Independent state.

[Kuznetsov] Outside of the Soviet Union.

[Bogdanov] Outside the Soviet Union, and if you have your naval base, most important naval base in the Baltic, out of your—I'm quite, you know [words indistinct]

[Kuznetsov] You're thinking in strategic, in geo-political terms, okay.

[Bogdanov] I'm thinking in many terms, including geostrategical terms. And let me go a little bit further, and to put this question to you and to Andrey: and what will happen to the European equilibrium? We great democrats—I overtype democrats—okay, we are. But what about equilibrium, what about the real life? what will happen to the European correlation of forces and all that?

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, you don't strike me, I mean you don't sound like a conservative, although some people may think you do sound like a conservative, a Moscow conservative.

[Bogdanov] I am....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] But, you know, this is one of the reasons for the civil war in the United States between the North and the South when secession was militarily denied to the South because this could have and indeed would have weakened America and it was obvious for those who wanted America to be a strong federal nation, so perhaps there's some...

[(Melville)] Now, Pavel, let me try to cool down the discussion a little bit.

[Kuznetsov] Okay, okay.

[(Melville)] I don't still think the situation is that terrible. I still hold the view that this to some extent is the attempt to influence the decisions which are going to be made in Moscow. And let's look at the situation from the perspective of analogy: What has happened in Canada with the Quebec situation? They were aspiring for independence and they had the referendum. Now, quite paradoxically, I may be wrong but something like 80 percent of the Quebec population didn't want to be separate from Canada. Why? The reason is very simple. Not political, not ideological, not psychological...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Economic.

[(Melville)] Economic. And that is the core issue. Look, just imagine a hypothetical situation: Lithuania or any other Baltic republic secedes and becomes an independent state. This would be a mass economic and social mess for them. And please don't think that some transnational corporations would come to help them and to build the nice kind of life...

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, that's what they think, actually.

[(Melville)] Yes, they will probably will face the danger of becoming something parallel to the countries in the South Africa, South America, or something like this. With the terrible influence of transnational corporations. So there are economic reasons for these countries, for these republics, not to go that far. And I don't think this is really what they want.

[Kuznetsov] I would agree with you, Andrey, in your analysis when you said well that you imagine that somebody would come in and help them out...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I don't think....

[Kuznetsov, continuing] ...bail them out, because all they have is Finland, the example of Finland, say Norway or Sweden which have been developing for decades and centuries as independent states. (?As they say:) Look at how nice life is in there, so somebody would certainly bail us out of this economic predicament, but I think this is done for political ends.

[Bogdanov] I don't agree with you gentlemen, I respect, and they're your views, I respect your views, but you are too sophisticated. You're too... [changes thought] Things are much simpler. These people in popular fronts they lost their, you know....

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Minds.

[Bogdanov] Minds. They hate their surroundings. And I'm not afraid to say that they hate so much their surroundings that they lost their minds. I'm sorry, but I'm afraid they don't know what they are doing.

[Kuznetsov] Okay.

[Bogdanov] And I am afraid, I am afraid that the point of discussion, of dialogue is already lost.

[Kuznetsov] All right. If, having said that, there's a followup to what you've just said, Radomir. One of the questions of, which is being asked very often in the West and in the United States in particular, and I'm a living witness to that, is: Is there a limit, any limits to the patience and tolerance of the central leadership in Moscow to what's going on? Will they bang on the table, will they send in (?lots of) troops to...

[Bogdanov, interrupging] I would like to be quite honest with my listeners over there. I wish there were, that's my answer.

[Kuznetsov] So you...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I wish there were.

[Kuznetsov] So, there's a hint...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I don't know, but I wish...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] You dropped a hint that there could be a possibility when...

[Bogdanov] Yes, I wish.

[(Melville)] Well, in a sense it's a black box. Nobody knows what will happen and how the black box will respond to the events outside. But let us face the consequences of this possible decision and everything is possible in today's world of politics. If this would be the decision, this would be the mortal blow to perestroyka and I'm absolutely sure that if the central leadership uses force to do whatever in the Baltics this would give the blow not simply to the relations between Moscow and the Baltics. (?This would be) a blow to perestroyka itself.

[Kuznetsov] Is it, in that sense, you know about the, you've heard about the appeal of George Bush, by George Bush to, for Moscow to show as much restraint for the Baltic republics.

[Bogdanov] Yes, what it's being doing all the time, by the way.

[Kuznetov] Yeah, as we did in Poland.

[Bogdanov] But, my question to you is: mortal blow to perestroyka, but what about the mortal blow to the integrity of this country?

[(Melville)] Well, I think the integrity of the country is the prime value of the state, that it should be preserved. And I'm not buying the argument about the civil war in the states, in the United States, because it exactly was the war to preserve the integrity of the (?country).

[Kuznetsov] What we have so far left out of our discussion is the fact that we are going to have another session of the Congress of People's Deputies and one of the options as far as I understand could be an attempt to renegotiate a treaty with the Baltic states. And if they settle for greater economic and even political autonomy within the common boundaries this could be a way out without using force which I believe, and I again side with Andrey. It'll be a catastrophe.

[Bogdanov] Pavel, what they (?were) suggested so far, that's what exactly you say. Their autonomy, their economical independence within the boundaries of the (?Soviet Union).

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, that was a promise and a pledge, and they complain that things go very slowly.

[Bogdanov] But that has been rejected now. It's not accepted now, even, not even, that is not accepted.

[Kuznetsov] Gentlemen, as time is running out on us, I think we have to conclude this program by trying to analyze this situation. On the one hand we have, and I think that a good amount, a good deal of people in those Baltic republics understand that breaking away from the Soviet Union is fraught with terrible consequences, consequences, in the first place economic consequences. There's a group of people, a rash group of people, politically oriented toward breaking away from the Soviet Union, that is, seceding. Do you really believe that there could be another compromise struck at this point, or as you said that we've gone as far as we've just crossed the line?

[Bogdanov] Of course, there is always a compromise, there is always room for a compromise. But compromise, this is not what you can strike alone. You need another side. I know that this side what you call Moscow is ready for compromise, but I don't know about the other side.

[Kuznetsov] Okay. Don't you believe there are the sober-minded elements within those republics that realise that perhaps they're pushing the limits of...

[(Melville)] I'm absolutely sure there are. And there are compromises and compromises. I'm not sure the centre is ready now for the compromise the Baltic republics are looking for. There are elements in the Baltic republics and in the popular fronts, and all these movements, who are ideologically determined to break with the Soviet Union. But I hope they will not play the first game, the first violins in the orchestra.

[Kuznetsov] They won't fire the first shot. Thank you, gentlemen, our time is up. That was "Top Priority" with Pavel Kuznetsov interviewing Radomir Bogdanov and (Andrey Melville) on the Baltic republics and we invite our listeners to tune in again to "Top Priority" a week from now at the same time and on the same wavelength. Goodbye.

United States & Canada

Bush Outlines Foreign Policy in TV Interview

LD0609081189 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 6 TASS—"I hope we never return to cold war days," United States President George Bush said in an interview with British journalist David Frost, broadcast by the U.S. PBS TV company on Tuesday.

On his own behalf and on behalf of "the vast majority in Congress" Bush said: "We want perestroika to succeed. We want glasnost to continue... I want to see progress continue, but they (the Soviets) are facing enormous economic problems".

Bush characterised Mikhail Gorbachev as an open and reform-minded politician. "He has tried very hard to fulfill any undertakings that he has made," Bush said. "He's working to keep his word".

Bush also said that he would love to be able to give Poland more aid, but Americans are "fighting a very large deficit that ties our hands in terms of American largesse".

Commenting on other international issues, Bush favored improved relations with Iran, called on Japan to open its market for U.S. companies and urged South African authorities to release black nationalist leader Nelson Mandela. The President hinted that he was prepared to send U.S. troops to Colombia to help fight drug barons, if such help is requested by the Columbian president.

Asked about the hardest decision he has faced during his seven months as president, Bush cited the "visceral" reaction of wanting to do something with those who killed Colonel Higgins.

U.S. Marine Colonel William Higgins was taken hostage in Lebanon and later killed by extremists.

"I don't want to put innocent lives at risk to avenge one (life). I don't want to see mothers and children weeping any more because of some action I might take," Bush said.

Medvedev Receives USIA Director

LD0509182289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1711 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 Sep (TASS)—Vadim Medvedev, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received Bruce Gelb, director of the USIA, today. He is in Moscow in connection with the opening of the "U.S. Design" exhibition.

During the conversation, the state of information and cultural exchanges between the USSR and the United States was discussed in general [v printsipialnom plane] and mutual satisfaction with their successful development was expressed.

At the interlocutor's request, Vadim Medvedev spoke about progress of the restructuring of Soviet society. It was stressed that the deep-running reforms that are being carried out in the USSR do not represent any threat to the West. At the same time, the hopes that the perestroyka is our society's evolution towards capitalism are an illusion. To count on using certain current difficulties for bringing pressure to bear on the Soviet Union is a naivety.

The American side stressed that the United States hopes that the reforms which are being carried out in the USSR will succeed. The United States highly appreciates the processes of democratization and glasnost which untie the initiative of people and expand their rights to decision-making. In the visitor's view, although there are forces in the United States prejudiced against perestroyka, they are not numerous and their influence on the shaping of U.S. policy is limited.

The American representatives also said that the United States is prepared for a maximum broad exchange of information and people both in the sphere of education, science, and culture, and in the sphere of the economy. They could share their experience in solving economic and technological problems and promote with practical deeds the success of Soviet reforms. For the sake of this, in their view, one should be more resolute in overcoming the bureaucratic barriers which are in evidence both in the United States and in the USSR.

The Soviet side agreed with these intentions. It was stressed that the USSR is for expanding mutually beneficial contacts and exchanges with the United States in all spheres, including the economy—where, in comparison with other spheres, progress is less obvious.

Sununu on 'Consistent' U.S. Policy Toward Poland

LD0409161189 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 4 TASS—John Sununu, the White House chief of staff, commented on the U.S. policy towards Poland in the CBS "Face the Nation" television program.

He described the U.S. policy towards Poland as being consistent. It produced results and led to the current situation in Poland, he emphasised.

He said it was the policy of gradual steps which consists in the fact that steps forward should be made as a step forward is made by Poland. It would be a mistake to try to change everything at once and the United States has already committeed this mistake in dealing with other matters.

According to Sununu, money throwing is not a solution to problems. The U.S. loans and subsidies granted to

Poland in the 1970's did not help and the country only accumulated a debt of 39 billion U.S. dollars. He said that the United States could not repeat the same mistake.

Commentary on U.S.-Soviet Summit Dialogue

LD0509292389 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1500 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] It's been anounced in Moscow that the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will hold talks with the American Secretary of State James Baker in the United States from 22-23 September. Viktor Glazunov has this comment.

So Soviet-American dialogue continues. It's a vitally important dialogue, not only in terms of bilateral relations but also in terms of international affairs as a whole. For example the problem of disarmament cannot be resolved unless the two countries with the biggest military potential tackle it seriously. The Soviet Union and the United States have already concluded a treaty on eliminating two types of nuclear missiles, which is being successfully implemented. The two sides have also made definite progress in paving the way for another more extensive treaty on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. There have also been definite achievements in other spheres. However we ought to have had an agreement already reached for concluding the treaty. Its high time to make more practical steps. In my opinion, writes Viktor Glazunov, the work over the preparation of a treaty on offensive weapons cuts, over the convention banning chemical weapons, and the halting of nuclear weapons testing has been drawn out. I believe Shevardnadze and Baker will take up all these issues during their talks and will try to find out solutions to certain debatable issues. However in today's situation we need a powerful political impulse, and this can only be imparted by decisions at the highest level. The main task at the coming talks between Shevardnadze and Baker consists of setting out the specific foundations for the next stage of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at the highest level.

One can wait of course until experts will finalize everything up to the last comma, but do we have enough time for this? Things keep moving. While experts are finalizing the details the military-industrial complex is pressing ahead with the new military programs, putting more and more obstacles in the way of disarmament. The barriers which diplomats cannot surmount so far should be removed. I think a new Soviet-American summit is required for this. President George Bush is standing in power for the eighth month already. Over this time Mikhail Gorbachev has visited London, Bonn, and Paris. Another Soviet-American summit is imminent. The overall atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. relations is favorable, despite the fact that Moscow has not closed its eyes to certain disagreements. Both Presidentt Bush and James Baker continually stress that these relations are developing in the right direction, and that the United States is striving for active, constructive, positive and increasingly broader relations with the Soviet Union. This is what our country wants too.

CPSU Greets U.S. Communist Party on Jubilee

PM0109130189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee anniversary greetings message to the Communist Party of the United States of America National Committee]

[Text] To the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States of America [CPUSA]:

Dear Comrades!
We ardently congratulate U.S. Communists on this significant date—the 70th anniversary of the CPUSA.

Born of the horror of American workers' class war, your party has traveled a difficult but glorious path. Such figures as John Reed and William Foster founded it and such acknowledged proletarian leaders as Eugene Dennis, Elizabeth Flynn, and Henry Winston grew up within its ranks. The CPUSA's activity has invariably focused on working people's rights, interests, and ideals and efforts aimed at ridding mankind of the threat of self-destructiion and strengthening peace and mutual understanding between peoples. Consistent internationalists, the U.S. Communists have always been patriots and devoted sons of their country. They are still true to this principle today despite all manner of slander and attacks.

Taking charge of the perestroyka and in-depth renewal of Soviet society, the CPSU proclaimed the new thinking as the basis of its international activity, including relations between the USSR and the United States. Improving these relations and organizing extensive and multifaceted ties between the peoples of the USSR and the United States were and still are the most important aim of the cooperation between our parties, which are united by ties of traditional friendship and solidarity.

We wish U.S. Communists success in upholding the interests of U.S. working people, and in the struggle for the ideals of peace, democracy, and social progress.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee

Alaskan Delegation Visits Soviet Union

Delegation Arrives in Magadan

LD0309105689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 3 Sep 89

[Text] Our correspondent reports that a delegation from the U.S. State of Alaska arrived in Magadan today. It is led by Governor Steve Cowper. The delegation includes trade specialists, assistants to the governor, journalists and representatives of the military affairs department. Prior to this the U.S. guests visited Chukotka. They have been to Eskimo villages and had a meeting with border guards at the border post on Rakhmanov island. They have been discussing issues of economic and cultural cooperation and proposals by the Americans for the inauguration of air services between Provideniya Bay and Nome and between Anadyr and Anchorage. There has been talk of links between Soviet and Alaskan Eskimoes. In Magadan the talks on cooperation will be continued. Then the delegation is to visit Khabarovsk and Vladivostok.

Cooperation at Visit Reported

LD0509164889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 5 Sep 89

["Ties—USA: Governor of Alaska a Guest in Magadan"—TASS headline]

[Excerpts] Magadan, 5 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Grigoriy Krasnogor reports:

The 6-day visit to the most easterly oblast of our country by the governor of that U.S. state, Steve Cooper, has ended with the signing of agreements on visa-free exchange of Eskimos of the State of Alaska and Magadan oblast, and on the establishment of a regular radio-relay link between Alaska (towns of Anchorage and Noma) and Chukotka (the town of Anadyr and the settlement of Provideniye). [passage omitted]

The first steps on the road to cooperation have already been taken. About 30 oblast enterprises have obtained the right to go independently onto the external market. The trade and industrial firm of "Magadon," with established direct trade ties with Alaskan business circles, has started working in the oblast center. [passage omitted] The volume of trade for this year is not great—about $600,000. But these are just the first steps.

Earlier an agreement was signed on the creation in Magadan of a joint Soviet-U.S. enterprise for the assembly of computers. The joint enterprise "Soviet Broker" has started working. [passage omitted]

China

Construction Begins on Railway Link to China

LD0509173289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1050 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Kazakhstan-China: Border Trade Is Developing—headline]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 5 Sep (TASS)—The construction of a railway line which will link the stations of Druzhba (USSR) and Alataw Shankou (China) [Alashankou] has begun. At the Soviet border station, transport construction workers today set about the construction of a mechanized depot which will handle [pererabatyvat] cargoes from China.

The line, which is planned to open by 1992, is a kind of bridge between western Europe and the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. It is difficult to overestimate its significance. Thus, thanks to the joining of the steel main lines of the USSR and China, cargoes from London to Shanghai will be delivered twice as fast as they are currently delivered by sea.

Both sides consider it expedient to set up in this area a zone of free trade.

As the Council of Ministers of Kazakhstan informed TASS correspondent Vladimir Cherkizov, border trade with China is developing at high rates. Over the past 3 years, the volume of trade turnover has grown almost fourfold and will soon reach 100 million Swiss francs.

PRC Ambassador Sees Prospects for Cooperation

OW0509103489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 4 Sep 89

[From the "Half an Hour With Wang Xiao" program, including a recorded interview on 1 Sept in Moscow with Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to the Soviet Union, by own station reporter]

[Excerpts] Of late, Soviet-Chinese relations have developed constantly, and diverse forms of cooperation have emerged. The Beijing Restaurant in Moscow, a Soviet-Chinese joint venture, is just one of the new forms of this cooperation. The restaurant opened ceremoniously on 1 September. [passage omitted]

Comrade Yu Hongliang, Chinese ambassador to the Soviet Union, attended the opening ceremony. Our station reporter asked him about prospects for cooperation between the two countries, including cooperation in developing joint ventures. Please listen to a recording:

[Begin recording] Economic cooperation has developed constantly along with the development of Soviet-Chinese relations. The development has been especially fast in the past few years. In addition to state-to-state trade, trade between regions and border areas has also developed. In addition to barter trade, other forms of cooperation, including joint ventures, have also emerged. For the two nations, joint ventures are something new. As things now stand, joint ventures are off to a good start. We have encountered many new problems. Many problems have already been solved, and the remaining ones are being solved step-by-step. [end recording]

The Chinese ambassador highly appraised the prospects for developing Soviet-Chinese joint-venture enterprises. He said:

[Begin recording] I believe prospects are bright because we two great neighbors share the world's longest borders and have frequent contacts. This kind of economic cooperation will benefit both of us. I believe this kind of cooperation will flourish and last a long time. [end recording] [passage omitted]

PRC Protests UN Rights Panel Decision

PM0409160589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Statement by PRC Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] A PRC Foreign Ministry spokesman has declared that the resolution on China adopted in Geneva 31 August by the 41st Session of the UN Human Rights Commission's Subcommission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities is overt interference in the PRC's internal affairs. "The Chinese Government takes a resolute stand against the 'resolution' and deems it illegal and inoperative," the Foreign Ministry spokesman added.

Khabarovsk-Harbin Air Link Inaugurated

LD0109222489 Moscow TASS in English 2203 GMT 1 Sep 89

[Text] Khabarovsk September 2 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Yuriy Vitrishchak:

The crew of the Chinese Chengyang territorial civil aviation directorate made the first flight from Harbin to Khabarovsk on Friday. A regular air link will be inaugurated between Harbin and Khabarovsk in September.

"Our aim was to study the technical possibility of flights between the two cities, Wang Xuanwen, chief engineer of the Chengyang civil aviation directorate and the head of the Chinese air crew, said.

Under an agreement, Soviet and Chinese crews will make weekly flights between Harbin and Khabarovsk. The new air line is necessary to cope with growing trade, economic and cultural cooperation between north eastern China and the Soviet Far East.

The line will cater for Soviet and Chinese citizens, foreign tourists and businessmen from Japan, the United States and countries of the Asian-Pacific region. The new air link will promote friendship between the Soviet Union and China, "Xuanwen said. [quotation mark as received]

The Khabarovsk airport already has regular air links with Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Khabarovsk planes will soon fly to the north western regions of the United States.

Northeast Asia

Zaykov Meets DPRK Capital Delegation

LD0609101489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Text] Comrade Zaykov, politburo member, CPSU Central Committee secretary, and first secretary of the Moscow city party committee, received today a delegation of the Pyongyang city committee of the Korean Workers' Party [KWP], headed by (Chu Yen-sik), secretary of the Pyongyang KWP City Committee, in Moscow. During the friendly meeting there was an exchange of views on the possibilities for further expansion in cooperation between the party organizations and labor collectives of the two fraternal capitals.

Vladivostok Proposes ROK University Exchange

SK0309070089 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 25 Aug 89

[Summary From Poor Reception] A few days ago, a Soviet publication published a report that the Far East National University in Vladivostok proposed relations with South Korean universities. A station reporter met with (Viktor Wallin), director of the Faculty of Oriental Studies of the Far East National University and asked him to explain this proposal in detail. Faculty director (Viktor Wallin) said the following:

[Begin (Wallin) recording in Russian with superimposed Korean translation] In March, last year, our university signed a treaty on cooperation with Seoul's [name indistinct] University. This treaty forecasts exchanges of specialists, students, (?research institutes), and textbooks. Implementation of this treaty will be determined by how the relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea develop. Further discussions on how to implement this agreement will be held between representatives of the two universities in (?November) in Seoul, South Korea. We are greatly interested in inviting (?language) experts from overseas. Professors from Harbin's Heilongjiang University will come to our country, and they will teach in our university for the next three years. We are planning to propose this sort of work to South Korean (?friends).

Prospects for exchanging university students on a regular basis are very bright. Ten students of the Faculty of Oriental Studies of the Far East National University will leave for China in September to have training, and an equal number of Chinese students will come to us. We expect that such a possibility will emerge. If such a possibility is to be successfully resolved, not only political problems but also more [word indistinct] problems must be resolved. One of our first tasks of this type is building dormitories and [word indistinct] for Americans. The Far East National University expects a South Korean company to build a dormitory for Americans on the compound of our university. One of the dormitories will accommodate students and other buildings will accommodate teachers, scholars, and trainees.

Our address is the Faculty of Oriental Studies, the Far East National University, (?56, 25 October Street, Vladivostok, 690000. Telex 223122 SATSU.) [end recording]

Mongolian Foreign Minister Stops in Moscow

PM0409155989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Ts. Gombosuren, Mongolian minister of foreign affairs, was in Moscow 2-3 September on his way to Belgrade to take part in the work of the ninth conference of nonaligned heads of state and government.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

SRV Delegation Leader Meets Nishanov in Moscow

PM0409142989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] An SRV delegation led by Vo Chi Cong, member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and chairman of the SRV State Council, stopped over in Moscow 1-3 September on its way to Belgrade to take part in the work of the ninth conference of nonaligned heads of state and government.

Vo Chi Cong had a friendly meeting with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, during which topical questions of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and international problems of mutual interest were discussed.

Text of Greetings to SRV Leaders Published

PM0409142389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[Soviet leadership bodies' greetings message to SRV leaders on revolution anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee
Comrade Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the SRV Council of State
Comrade Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers
Comrade Le Quang Dao, chairman of the SRV National Assembly

Dear comrades!
On the occasion of the 44th anniversary of the August Revolution's victory and the formation of an independent democratic state in the ancient land of Vietnam, we send greetings and best wishes to you and the fraternal Vietnamese people.

The August Revolution's victory and the proclamation of the country's independence 2 September 1945 opened new historical prospects before Vietnamese society. Under the Communist Party's leadership Vietnam's people have traveled the thorny path of heroic struggle for the motherland's freedom and independence, in defense of the revolutionary gains, and for the implementation of radical socioeconomic transformations.

This year the SRV's national holiday is being celebrated in an atmosphere of energetic activity by the party and the people aimed at implementing the course elaborated by the Sixth CPV Congress and at renewal of all spheres of the country's social life, the creation of favorable international conditions for solving important national economic tasks, and the improvement of the political climate in Southeast Asia.

Soviet people value highly and appreciate the traditions of friendship and all-around collaboration with Vietnam, cemented by the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. The perestroyka and renewal implemented by our parties and peoples are creating conditions for enhancing the efficiency of multifaceted Soviet-Vietnamese ties. In the spirit of the new political thinking the Soviet Union and Vietnam are building up efforts in the international arena in the interests of peace and security in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

Dear comrades, we wish you, the Communists, and the whole Vietnamese people great successes in socialist building, as well as peace, happiness, and prosperity.

CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

Supreme Soviet Group Visits Melbourne Businesses

LD0509200689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1221 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Melbourne, 5 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Aleksey Voronin reports:
During its stay here in the capital of one of the largest states of Australia, the Soviet parliamentary delegation led by Deputy Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nikolay Dementey, today visited several firms and had meetings with representatives of the country's business circles.

The People's Deputies visited a major food complex of the Australian branch of the Heinz transnational corporation. They looked round the workshops of the enterprise which produces a variety of foodstuffs—from children's food to tomato ketchup and various canned goods. The guests were shown the automatic lines for the preparation and packaging of produce and were given a demonstration of the constant monitoring of quality with the assistance of computers. The heads of the complex told of the striving both of the whole corporation and of its Australian branch to get business links underway with the Soviet Union and to organize mutally beneficial cooperation with the USSR on the basis of both direct export and of joint enterprises.

During the meeting with leading officials of the state Australian Wheat Board—an old partner of Soviet foreign trade orgnizations—questions of the further strengthening of business ties were discussed. In particular, it is a question of implementing the agreement on opening a bakery with a small bake-house in the center of Moscow. This joint enterprise is to start working in February-March next year. The baker will be able to offer Muscovites around 3 tonnes of hot "Australian" bread each shift.

The delegation also visited Lada Motors of Australia which imports motor vehicles from the USSR. The deputies were shown the firm's presale preparation workshops. The vehicles enter the wide network of automobile dealers in various areas of the country where Soviet motor vehicles are in quite good demand.

Tomorrow, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation flies to the Australian capital, Canberra, where in the course of 2 days there lies ahead a whole series of official meetings, including with the country's governor-general, the prime minister, and leaders of the Federal Parliament.

Rogachev Receives Australian Diplomat

LD0509132589 Moscow TASS in English 1225 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—Ninian Stephen, Australia's ambassador for ecology, was received by Igor Rogachev, Soviet deputy foreign minister, today.

Further development of Soviet-Australian cooperation, including environmental protection, was discussed in the course of the friendly talk in which Australia's ambassador to the USSR Charles Robin Ashwin also participated.

Indonesia's Suharto Interviewed on Upcoming Visit

LD0409113189 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] Jakarta September 4 TASS—President Suharto of Indonesia qualified his forthcoming visit to the Soviet Union as a new phase in relations between Indonesia and the Soviet Union over the past quarter of a century.

In his interview to correspondents of TASS and the Soviet State Committee for Television and Radio, given on the eve of this important event, he expressed the conviction that the forthcoming exchange of views with Mikhail Gorbachev would deepen mutual understanding between the two countries. "I am also sure," the Indonesian president said, "that the results of these exchanges will make up our common contribution to the improvement of the situation in the Asian-Pacific region and all over the world."

The president noted that Indonesia followed attentively the Soviet Government's new political initiatives in domestic and external policies. "We are following from afar the policy of perestroika and glasnost, effected in the Soviet Union under the leadership of President Gorbachev," the Indonesian leader said. "We want perestroika and glasnost to yield the best of results for the sake of the Soviet peoples progress and prosperity."

Dwelling on processes now occurring in Indonesia and aimed at promoting the country's comprehensive development, he stressed that the dynamic changes taking place in both countries, as well as on a world-wide scale, were aimed at expanding constructive cooperation for the sake of promoting the progress of each state, for the sake of the joint contribution they could make for the good of all the world.

Asked about the prospects for future cooperation in the Asian-Pacific region, the Indonesian president noted the need of developing economic cooperation in keeping with the new requirements. "From the regional viewpoint," he continued, "Indonesia regards the association of South-east Asian nations as a form of cooperation on which our foreign policy is mostly hinged. Together with other ASEAN countries Indonesia will continue its efforts to turn South-east Asia into a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality, including a nuclear-free zone as one of its most important components."

Opposition to U.S. Bases in Singapore Noted

OW0509124889 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 29 Aug 89

[Valentinov commentary]

[Text] Not long ago, Singapore decided to allow the installation of U.S. military bases on its territory. This has become a sharp issue. At the same time, the decision will raise another question: What stand will the other ASEAN member countries take? In addition to Singapore, the other ASEAN members include the Philippines, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia, and Brunei. It seems the governments of these countries are facing some difficulties. Their stand is still not very firm. The legislators of the ASEAN countries have already expressed their views in this connection. In this regard, our station commentator Valentinov says:

The ASEAN parliamentary meeting has just ended in Manila, the capital of the Philippines. Many issues were discussed during the meeting. However, almost every representative mentioned Singapore's offer of military bases to the United States. Despite the efforts of the Singapore delegation head to prevent the participants from discussing the issue, he still had to mention the issue himself.

In the communique issued by the meeting, the ASEAN lawmakers clearly stated their own stance. The communique emphatically pointed out that foreign military presence in the region runs counter to ASEAN countries' efforts for peace, self-reliance, and neutrality. The ASEAN lawmakers also supported the plan to establish a nuclear free zone in Southeast Asia.

In an attempt to prevent the participants of the meeting from interfering in Singapore's plan, the Singapore delegation head claimed: The Philippines is the only nation in the region with U.S. military bases; Singapore's offer is aimed at supporting the Philippines. This kind of thinking is entirely groundless. It was refuted by the Philippine representative.

While the ASEAN parliamentary meeting was in session, Philippine senators were also debating the issue of U.S. military bases. Twelve senators adopted a resolution which called for abolishing the Philippine-U.S. military bases agreement. It is known to all that this agreement will expire in 1990. Senator (Wagbelto Carniyaza), leader of the Philippine opposition movement, said that in order to show their stand to the world, he and his colleagues endorsed the resolution.

A Supreme Soviet delegation attended the ASEAN parliamentary meeting as an observer and supported the just stand of the ASEAN legislators. The Soviet Union has reaffirmed its support for the plan to turn Southeast Asia into a region of peace, freedom, and independence and for the establishment of a nuclear free zone in Southeast Asia. In Beijing, officials of the Chinese Foreign Ministry also denounced the deal being planned by the United States and Singapore.

Naturally, the decision made by the ASEAN parliamentary meeting is not binding on the governments of the ASEAN countries. However, I believe there are relations between the executive branch and the legislative branch in every ASEAN country. I believe the decision of the Manila meeting will have a great impact on the situation in the region. Singapore deputy prime minister has said that his government plans to review its offer to allow U.S. military bases on its territory. His statement should be clear evidence of this impact.

Commentary Marks Malaysian National Day

BK0109134589 Moscow in Malay to Malaysia 1000 GMT 31 Aug 89

[Viktor Vasiliyev commentary on the occasion of Malaysia's 32d National Day Commemoration]

[Text] It is easier today to note the widespreading principles of modern political thinking. The Soviet Union is the advocator by providing good influence in the Soviet Union-Malaysia relations. This was especially observed in the international political arena—whether concerning general or important issues related to bilateral relations.

Malaysia's positive contributions through its various activities in trying to create a (?healthy) international climate in the Asia-Pacific region is highly admired by our country. We share Malaysia's aspiration to create a truly mutual understanding and cooperation among all countries—irrespective of their diverse sociopolitical systems. Within this [words indistinct] context, Malaysia is consequently supporting ASEAN's idea to create a nonnuclear zone in Southeast Asia—without any foreign military presence in the region. It can be considered that the Soviet Union-Malaysia bilateral relations have brought satisfaction to the two countries.

We note that the visit by the Malaysian prime minister, Datuk Sri Dr Mahathir Mohamed, to the Soviet Union in 1987 and his meeting with the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, provided a strong encouragement for the current developing bilateral relations. During their meeting, they expressed common interest and agreement on important problems facing the Asia-Pacific regional countries.

On bilateral relations, good prospects can be envisioned. Datuk Sri Dr Mahathir Mohamed stated that Malaysia supports the development of bilateral cooperation with the Soviet Union in various sectors and currently there are no obstacles in the strengthening of the existing bilateral relations between the two countries. This was observed, among other things, through the desire to further activate the Soviet Union-Malaysia bilateral relations. There are numerous aspects to this. The current smooth flow of increased bilateral trade is implemented through new beneficial forms of bilateral cooperation. Among other things, our country is currently interested in establishing joint business ventures with Malaysian enterpreneurs. The Soviet Union is willing to increase its supply of commodities to Malaysia—to our regular, long established and interested customers. Among the export commodities are equipment for Malaysia's steel, cement, and rubber industries. It is hoped that due to brighter prospects the bilateral relations between the two countries will further expand in other avenues.

It is the Soviet people's tradition to extend their cordial and friendly relations to the people of Malaysia. We are very pleased with Malaysia's progress in developing its national economy and improving the people's standard of living. We rejoice with Malaysia in gaining the international community's trust and respect.

We convey our felicitations to our listeners in Malaysia on the occasion of Malaysia's national day anniversary and hope that there will be more achievements.

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Policy in Occupied Territories Viewed

LD0509164989 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 5 Sep 89

["Israel's Policy in Occupied Territories—TASS Comment."—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—By TASS Political News Analyst Yevgeniy Babenko:

Two reports that came from the Middle East region today are characteristic of the situation there.

With reference to Israeli official circles, AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE reports that Tel Aviv adopted a five year plan of the armed forces development. It, specifically, envisages the reduction of the Army's numerical strength and the change of the structure of the Air Force and armoured troops by adopting new armaments systems and enhancing the role of special units for electronic warfare. So this plan apparently means the modernisation of the Israeli armed forces to enhance their effectiveness.

And the aim of this effectiveness is not at all defence against some external enemy but the continuation of the course of expansion and aggression which Tel Aviv steadily conducts against its Arab neighbours.

There is a TASS correspondent's report from Beirut saying that on September 4 Israeli planes made another raid on the south Lebanese populated locality Majdal Balkhis [name as received]. Six people were killed, considerable destruction was caused. On the same day Israelis shelled the city of al-Nabatiyah in south Lebanon. There were civilian casualties. Considerable damage was caused to peasants' homes, orchards and crops.

AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE said in its report that the modernisation of Tel Aviv's armed forces is "complicated" by the Palestinian uprising [Uprising] in occupied Arab lands and that its suppression requires more funds than rearming. But who is it that provoked the Intifadah that was started in the Gaza Strip and West Bank of Jordan in December 1987? Were it local people who are only upholding their rights, or occupiers who use violence?

The Intifadah opened a real prospect for the exercise of the Palestinian people's national rights in the framework of their own state. More than 100 countries have already recognised the Palestinian state and the United States had to start a dialogue with PLO.

In these conditions Tel Aviv is aggravating the situation in the Middle East area. It is reported that the military command decided to use Army helicopters against the rebels. Searching for new methods to crush the Intifadah, Israelis started forming military units of Arab collaborationists and intend to use them also for the penetration of the Palestinian resistance movement and for staging acts of subversion and various provocations.

These methods do not bring closer the moment of a fair settlement of the Middle East problems and this is indicated by the Palestinian uprising which lasts for 21 months.

'Anxiety' Toward Israel Noted

LD3108092189 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 31 Aug 89

[Text] New York August 31 TASS—The U.N. Security Council has held, at the request of a group of Arab countries, an emergency session to consider the situation on the occupied Palestinian territories. The resolution that the Security Council adopted, with 14 members voting in favor and one, the United States abstaining, expresses profound anxiety of this crucial body of the United Nations over the developments on the occupied territories and its regret in connection with the deportations by Israel, an occupying power, of Palestinian civilians.

The resolution contains an appeal to Israel to immediately put an end to deportations of Palestinian civilians and to secure a prompt and safe return of those deported to their homes.

The Security Council reiterated that the Geneva Convention (1949) on the protection of civilians in the time of war was applicable to the Palestinian territories including Jerusalem, occupied by Israel since 1967, and other occupied Arab territories.

This is the second time in two months that the Security Council has to consider the same question. However, as became clear from the speech at the session of an Israeli representative, Tel Aviv has no intention to pay heed to the appeals of the international community.

Moreover, the Israeli representative insisted that the Israeli authorities showed restraint in relation to the Palestinian population and sought to justify deportations.

Iran's Besharati Hails Ties With USSR

LD0509185289 Moscow TASS in English 1529 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Tehran September 5 TASS—Iranian-Soviet relations are now developing intensively, first deputy foreign minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran 'Ali Mohammad Besharati said in an interview with the TEHRAN TIMES.

He said he hoped for further improvement of relations between the two countries in the near future.

Besharati recalled that important bilateral agreements were signed during the June visit to the Soviet Union of 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, now president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Iranian first deputy foreign minister stressed that the Soviet Union had thus shown goodwill toward Iran and its desire to further improve relations with the Islamic Republic of Iran.

'Political Liberalization' in Iran Discussed

NC0109125489 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 31 Aug 89

[Interview with Radio Moscow commentator Aleksandr Batyev]

[Text] [Announcer in studio] Many foreign analysts have commented recently about the liberalization of political life in Iran. It seems that with the election of the new president, the domestic policy of the Islamic Republic will change and be reviewed, and that this policy will adopt a more democratic and more open character. How correct is this assessment? Our commentator Aleksandr Batyev says:

[Batyev, speaking in Russian, fading into Persian translation] Dear listeners, specific changes have taken place recently in the Iranian leadership's domestic policy. Meanwhile, the trend of democratization of domestic political life can be very clearly seen. For example, after 8 years' delay, the Iranian Government has officially permitted political parties and organizations to operate. Permission has already been granted to four groups to set up headquarters, to publish newspapers, to express their views on radio and television, and to hold news conferences.

[Announcer] What kind of organizations are these?

[Batyev] These organizations are: the Iranian Women's Organization headed by the daughter of the late Imam Khomeyni; the Combatant Clerical Council headed by current Majlis Speaker Mehdi Karrubi; the Organization of Islamic Feda'iyan; and the Organization of Islamic Authors and Painters. Moreover, according to the Interior Ministry, 60 political parties have asked for permission to start operating.

[Announcer] Do you think that we can now say that political parties are free in Iran?

[Batyev] I do not want to express a decisive view, and I will explain why. First of all, the Iranian officials have legalized only those political groups that are completely faithful to the government and in whose devotion to the government there is no doubt, while the activities of large organizations which were formerly well-known but which advocate nonreligious views continue to be defunct. Secondly, assuring legal guarantees have not yet been ensured on the true freedom of political parties and a series of important limitations continue to be in effect. For example, even though 'Abbas Sheybani, representative of an opposition group known as the Liberation Movement of Iran participated in the presidential elections, the government has not yet allowed the republication of the said party's organ MIZAN which was banned in 1981. As you can see, everything is still very vague.

[Announcer] Did the new domestic political trends affect the formation of the new cabinet?

[Batyev] I think so. At any rate, the formation of the new cabinet was linked with many unusual events. For example, for the first time in the history of the Islamic Republic, secret voting was conducted for the ministerial candidates presented by 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani. It is very clear that this was a step toward the democratization of the parliament and a freer and more sincere expression of the Majlis deputies' will. Moreover, the new cabinet's program foresees expansion of the political rights of the citizen. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani recently announced that his cabinet will be formed to pave the way for preventing dictatorship by relying on freedom and on the respect of each and every citizen. In short, the inclination toward the expansion of political freedom in Iran is being pursued very clearly. But as to how this policy can materialize as a true policy is another issue.

[Announcer] We thank you for your remarks.

Afghanistan Denies Presence of Soviet Advisers

LD0409133889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] The Afghan Foreign Ministry has stated that there are no Soviet military advisers in the country. An official statement issued yesterday in Kabul strongly denies a claim by Thompson, the U.S. representative with the provisional opposition government, that there are 300 Soviet military advisers in Afghanistan at the present time. According to the U.S. diplomat, they are supervising the use of military equipment by the government troops in battles with the rebels. The purpose of this false allegation is to distract attention from Western and other interference in the war against Afghanistan, the Foreign Ministry statement says.

'Northern War' Between Afghan Rebels Noted

LD0309193189 Moscow TASS in English 1853 GMT 3 Sep 89

[Text] Kabul September 3 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Andrey Greshnov:

The expression "northern war" is now current in the lexicon of Afghans who witnessed these days the escalation of hostilities between units of the Islamic Society and Gulbuddin Hikmatyar's Islamic Party in a number of northern, north-western and central districts of Afghanistan. The war provoked by extremists' leader Hikmatyar to demonstrate "combat potential" to patrons in the United States, might have unpredictable consequences even for himself.

The disturbed hornet's nest of the Islamic Society and the organisation's allies are apparently bent on revenge to cutthroats from the Islamic party for murdering a number of prominent field commanders who headed units of the Islamic Society and of other opposition parties. More armed units and also representatives of the clergy having much prestige now join in the internicine war.

According to the latest information, a jerga (council) of religious leaders supporting Ahmad Shah Masud, leader of the islamic society forces in the northeast of the country, was held in the Panjsher Valley. The participants in the jerga addressed all Afghan Muslims with the message urging them to pool the efforts in the struggle against "extremist Hikmatyar and units of Wahabbis who betrayed Islam".

Units of the Islamic society have dealt in the recent days so strong blows at their one-time allies and now sworn enemies that Hikmatyar had to withdraw a considerable number of his units from the area of Jalalabad and send them to other provinces to preserve the traditional spheres of his influence. While Hikmatyar's prestige is obviously declining among the Afghan opposition, his prestige in the West is, apparently, falling, too. Even though it is precisely the head of the Islamic Party who pocketed the lion's share of the United States' and West European countries' financial and military aid, he can hardly win the "northern war" from Ahmad Shah Masud. It should also be noted that Masud has been able to rally his numerous supporters among field commanders from various opposition parties.

U.S. Works Out New Afghan Aid Strategy

LD0309153989 Moscow TASS in English 1303 GMT 3 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 3 TASS—In an attempt to acheive a military solution to the armed conflict in Afghanistan, the United States has worked out a new strategy of giving aid to the armed Afghan opposition.

The strategy is to deliver guns and money directly to guerrilla commanders and tribal leaders inside Afghanistan, THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reported today with reference to informed sources.

Until recently U.S. aid was sent to seven Pakistan-based Afghan rebel groups and through them was supplied to Afghanistan. The uneven character of the distribution of weapons and money among the leaders of groups was one of the causes of infighting between various factions of the 'freedom fighters'.

One aim of the new strategy, the article points out, is to reduce warfare among the rebels and to raise the efficiency of their combat actions against the Afghan Government.

Some Pakistani official spokesmen and Western diplomats expressed doubts about whether the new approach will succeed.

THE WASHINGTON POST emphasises that Washington and Islamabad, while stating their support for a political settlement in Afghanistan, at the same time encourage the rebels' refusal to hold negotiations which the Soviet Union and the Afghan Government call for. The United States and Pakistan insist on rebels' military actions with a view to either overthrowing the government of President Najibullah or gaining a stronger negotiating position.

The same sources are confident that a steady military progress on the part of the rebels is unrealistic. The newspaper points out that for many years the rebels have been preoccupied with factional strife and besides their morale declined in view of the military impasse following the withdrawal of Soviet troops in recent years.

Nevertheless, during a tour of Pakistan this week, Peter Tomsen, representative of the U.S. President to the Afghan armed opposition, made it clear that Washington continues to believe that rebels can win a victory over the Soviet Union-supported government on the battlefield.

Afghan Opposition Rejects Peace Overtures

PM0109101589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 89 First Edition p 5

[Veniamin Shurygin "Viewpoint": "Good Opportunity Missed"]

[Text] The other day the Afghan armed opposition rejected the Kabul government's new peace-loving proposals set out in a speech by President Najibullah 19 August. In those proposals the Afghan Government expressed its readiness to begin dialogue with the opposition on an individual or a collective basis in any country the latter suggested. It expressed agreement to the holding of a nationwide conference on a peace settlement where accords could be reached on forming a leadership council with broad powers. During a 6-month cease-fire that council could create a broadly representative coalition government and elect a commission to devise a new draft constitution and prepare a law on elections to a National Council. Kabul also agreed to hold general elections under international control and to convene an international conference on Afghanistan involving such countries as Afghanistan itself, the USSR, Pakistan, Iran, the United States, India, and China.

As we can see, the Afghan leadership's new peace-loving initiative contains all the conditions necessary for the restoration of peace on Afghanistan's long-suffering land and the normalization of the situation in the region. It ensures the Afghan people's free expression of their will on the question of the nature and path of the country's development. In brief, the opposition was offered yet another opportunity to end the fratricidal bloodshed and take a worthy part in building a peaceful life. Nevertheless, this opportunity has been spurned.

It is hard to say just what the "intransigents" are guided by and what they are hoping for. The situation within the opposition has been deteriorating recently. Fierce internecine clashes have been continuing between individual groupings, leaving more than 300 rebels dead and hundreds more wounded. Recently the "Islamic party of Afghanistan," headed by Hekmatiyar, announced that it was withdrawing from the so-called "transitional government" set up last February with help from the Pakistani and U.S. special services. It is not impossible that Hekmatiyar's move will signal the beginning of the collapse of the "Peshawar seven." The contradictions between the opposition groupings based in Pakistan and Iran have not been settled.

Nor can the oppositionists boast of military successes inasmuch as they are suffering setbacks at Jalalabad and elsewhere. An increasing number of field commanders are realizing the futility of seeking a military solution to the Afghan problem, are ending the armed struggle, and entering into talks with the government. Each day tens and hundreds of Afghans are being killed in the continuing senseless rocket attacks and bombardments.

In these conditions what is the sense of using the language of ultimatums and demands for capitulation and the handing over of power, as the opposition is trying to do toward Kabul? It shows nothing but a craving for power, personal ambition, and a sense of vengeance.

How long will Afghans go on killing Afghans? That question is being asked increasingly loudly in the world and has the ring of an accusation against the opposition and its foreign backers who are rejecting the Afghan government's peace initiatives. Today they and they alone bear the responsibility for each Afghan child killed in the barbarous rocket attacks and for the countless sufferings inflicted on the Afghans by the ongoing civil war.

In this situation the role played by the United States, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and a number of other countries which are giving active support to the Afghan opposition and are essentially encouraging it to continue the bloodshed appears in an increasingly unseemly light. Their much-vaunted statements about respecting the Afghan people's right to choose and their commitment to a political solution of the Afghan problem do not match their practical actions at all. A double standard in politics is particularly intolerable when it concerns the fate of a whole people and peace and stability in the region.

Saudi Communist Party Congress Statement Cited

PM0509142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On Principles of Marxism-Leninism"]

[Text] Beirut, 1 Sep—Remaining loyal to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Communist Party of Saudi Arabia [CPSA] perceives its main tasks inside the country as being to propagandize progressive and democratic ideas and to strengthen the alliance between the country's national-patriotic forces in defense of the interests of the working class and the peasantry, according to a statement on the results of the Third CPSA Congress published in the Lebanese newspaper AL-NIDA'.

The document notes that the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe, the expansion of the process of easing international tension, and the prevention of all manifestations of fascism and racism are now the main concerns of mankind. Saudi Arabia's Communists declared their readiness to continue the struggle to stabilize the situation in the Near East and eliminate foreign military bases in the region, primarily in the Persian Gulf region. The CPSA advocated the establishment of lasting peace between Iraq and Iran and demanded the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967 and the implementation of the Palestinian Arab people's inalienable national rights to self-determination and the creation of their own independent state under the leadership of their sole legitimate representative, the PLO.

The statement notes that the changes occurring in the USSR are having a positive effect on the situation in the world, and points out that perestroyka, glasnost, and the new political thinking highlight universal human values in relations between states, while confrontation is being replaced by cooperation for the attainment of common human goals.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Tigray Front Attack on Ethiopian Army Viewed

EA0409122389 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 1 Sep 89

[Text] We present a commentary by Maksim Yevgenyev on the current Ethiopian situation: The Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF] attack on the Ethiopian Government Army in the north of the country was unexpected. According to the Ethiopian president, Comrade Mengistu Haile Mariam, when he addressed the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia [PDRE] National Shengo meeting on 31 August. The attack took place a few hours after it had been reported that the government had reached an agreement to hold peace talks with the TPLF. The Ethiopian leader, Comrade Mengistu Haile Mariam said: They made this treacherous attack after having told us earlier that they had accepted the peace initiative. The Ethiopian deputies have demanded that this treacherous attack be countered immediately. The State Council statement distributed to the Shengo meeting indicated that the Ethiopian people would not stand idly by when the TPLF made such a provocative reply to their peace call.

Let us recall what has recently been going on in Ethiopia. At the beginning of last June, the National Shengo adopted a peace initiative. The biggest opposition group in Tigray Province, the so-called TPLF, agreed to hold talks with the PDRE Government without preconditions and immediately. The other opposition party, the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [EPLF], also expressed its readiness to do so wihout much delay. A period of relative calm in the northern part of the country then followed.

The Ethiopian Government has agreed with the TPLF peacefully to resolve the Eritrean problem, which it inherited from the past regime. The preliminary talks are to open in Atlanta in a few days. It was hoped that the acceptance of the peace talks by the EPLF and the TPLF and the beginning of preliminary talks in Atlanta would lead to the end of the civil war in northern Ethiopia for the foreseable future, said Maksim Yevgenyev in his commentary. The attack of the secessionist TPLF was deliberately made to coincide with the opening of the Shengo meeting.

There is no doubt that their attack is provocative and treacherous. War has again erupted in the north of the country, but what makes it more alarming is that it affects the peace initiative. By showing their real face in this treacherous move in this way, the TPLF have clearly identified who is against peace in the region. But the TPLF is not the biggest group in the peace process. Those who support the peaceful resolution of the problem will, I hope, make progress in the peace process, led by sound thinking, says Maksim Yevgenyev concluding his commentary.

South Africa's Foreign Contacts Examined

MB0309205089 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 31 Aug 89

["South Africa Today" commentary by Aleksandr Fedorov—read by announcer]

[Text] I don't know about you, but I get the impression that the ruling Nationalist Party in South Africa has now decided to make up for the lost opportunities, in terms of contacts with the rest of the world.

Ever since the party leader, Frederick de Klerk, has become the country's acting president, he has been meeting statesmen of both the countries friendly with South Africa and those taking a stand of intolerance to apartheid. It is believed that talks with President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia were most important.

First of all, the (?effects) speed up De Klerk's climb up the hierarchial ladder and cost Pieter Botha, who used to oppose any contacts with Kaunda, his presidential post. But this is the sensational part of these negotiations, so to speak. As for their political importance, it should be recalled here that the Zambian president is the chairman of the group of the Frontline States. It is in this capacity that he was spelling out his views and the problems of southern Africa.

The leaders of the two countries were unanimous in believing that the agreements reached in July this year in the Zairian town of Gbadolite between the Angolan Government and the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] grouping were of vital importance. They should be regarded as (?truth) documents that provide for the restoration of peace in Angola.

President Kaunda told a news conference that Zambia and South Africa will continue contacting over this issue. The South African stand has probably been promoted by realistic calculations and also by the results of the talks that President de Klerk had with the UNITA leader, Jonas Savimbi, and earlier with President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire, who is acting as a mediator in a peaceful settlement in Angola. These calculations are based on the premise that Pretoria will [word indistinct] neither politically nor economically if it decides to continue giving support to UNITA.

After the agreements reached in Gbadolite, the Angolan antigovernment grouping violated the cease-fire commitments taken upon themselves many a times, and, as it can be seen from the interview given by Jonas Savimbi, it keeps distorting the meaning of the political settlement plan in the country.

The cooperation with such a partner may have its bearing on the fate of De Klerk himself. I don't think that people in South Africa may be delighted with the lessons given to them from time to time by the bankrupt politician who puts South Africa, thereby, in an awkward position. Now, this is at a time when their country has been taking steps, no matter how slow, to stabilize the situation in the south of the African Continent.

When De Klerk acts with confidence under foreign policy (?strain), the same can hardly be said about his approach to the country's domestic problems. These are the steps of a man who is trying to cover his tracks, fleeing from his persecutors.

We remind our listeners at this point that on 21 August, the participants in a top-level conference on the (?statutory) OAU committee on southern Africa passed a declaration [words indistinct] that South African authorities are expected to lift the state of emergency that has been in effect for the 4th year in the country.

The ban should be lifted on the activities of antiracist organizations, all political prisoners should be released, and the troops should be withdrawn from African townships.

De Klerk did his best to avoid the discussion of these (?provisions) during his meeting with African leaders, saying that the situation in the country, prior to the elections, scheduled for 6 September, is very uncertain. Yet at home, De Klerk has clamped down on the African National Congress, accusing it of being engaged in the policy of intimidation and violence. This is the pretext that De Klerk predecessors constantly resorted to in an attempt to justify the unwillingness to carry out a dialogue with the leading organization of the African people [words indistinct] pronouncements of de Klerk questionable.

One [word indistinct] have much trust in their [words indistinct] as a politician with processes concerned for nearly all people living on the globe and [word indistinct] they agree remains a different to those [word indistinct] conditions of (?meaningful) Africans in his own country.

The only hope remains to look forward to the stage-by-stage [word indistinct] which the acting president refers to so often, but the promised changes have already been long overdue.

Somali President's Multiparty Proposal Praised

EA0409194089 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 31 Aug 89

["Commentary" from World Events today; read by announcer]

[Text] SOMALI NATIONAL NEWS AGENCY reports that Somalia will become a multi-party state after the country's constitution is amended towards the end of 1990. Our commentator Vladimir Borisov says the president of the Somali Democratic Republic, Comrade Mohamed Siad Barre, who is also secretary general of the ruling party, Somalia's only political party, told the party Central Committee of the need to prepare the country for inevitable economic changes. He said any political change would have an impact and historical repercussions.

However, the government is not only concerned with the country's economic strategy, which has lost direction. It has also lost its administrative grip over many regions of the country which are now in the hands of armed rebels fighting along clan lines. For example the Somali National Movement [SNM] is waging a war in the north of the country, the Somali Patriotic Movement is fighting in the south, and the Somali Salvation Democratic Front is fighting in central Somalia. The regime's relations with its friends, particularly the Americans, seem strained these days. They are accusing the Somali regime of human rights violations and of being undemocratic. The Somali Government has come under repeated fire recently for its alleged gross violations of human rights.

Therefore, in view of the prevailing situation in Somalia, the announcement by the country's president on the proposed multiparty system could make it easier for the country to receive the increased military and other forms of aid which it wants from its friends. The move appears to be an important one, but certainly not the most important. The president has invited the most powerful of the rebel groups, the SNM, which has already proposed the return of a multi-party system, to hold talks with him. Now the president has opened the way for the opposition to challenge him in a peaceful and democratic way.

Being a matured and experienced politician who has been ruling the country for the past 20 years, he wants to see political changes and moves towards better understanding while power is still vested in his hands and in the hands of the Armed Forces. Another reason for this sensible and intelligent move by the government is to buy time in which to strengthen its weakened regime and see whether it can help break the current stalemate on the battlefield. It is also possible that this move could appeal to the opposing groups who may be tired of the endless war in the country.

Will the opposition have the courage to give the government's new move a chance and turn their movements into national political parties? The answer to this question is a difficult one. The opposition groups are divided and disorganized. They are influenced by regionalism and greed. But the government has taken a courageous step by allowing opposition groups to take part in the forthcoming election and form their own parties.

East Europe

SFRY's Loncar Previews Belgrade Summit

PM0509110989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with Budimir Loncar, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, by APN correspondent S. Gryzunov: "The Nonaligned Movement: Community of Interests"—no place or date of interview specified; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Yugoslavia is one of the founders and recognized leaders of the Nonaligned Movement. Budimir Loncar, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, answered questions by APN correspondent S. Gryzunov on the eve of the Ninth Conference of the heads of state and government from nonaligned countries which is due to begin its work in Belgrade 4 September (the leaders of diplomatic departments have assembled so far).

[Gryzunov] Following the September summit meeting, Yugoslavia will take over as chairman of the Nonaligned Movement, whose modernization has been the topic of much that has been said and written recently. Comrade federal secretary, how do you perceive the renaissance of the movement's policy and activity?

[Loncar] You could have remarked that a clear delineation is always made between the policy of nonalignment and the Nonaligned Movement. Policy is something strategically thought out, something that is always present in each element of activity. On the other hand, the movement is just a concrete expression of this policy and of its practical effectiveness.

Thus, we are not talking about a renaissance of policy itself. Not because it is a dogma, not because we are dealing with something that has been limited in advance and thus precludes the chance of any development. Ever since it was first formulated, and that was 28 years ago, the policy of nonalignment has remained an integral philosophy and strategy of perceiving and recognizing the fact of pluralism in the world and the interests which unite it. This policy did not coincide with any choice of ideology, and within its own ranks it did not lean toward monolithic unity which would be out of line with the movement's democratic nature.

It is a different matter when talking about a renaissance of the functioning of this policy. I am often inclined to think that we are lagging behind our own stances. This means that, in our actions, we are lagging behind the times, which changed the direction of the movement in the world or, if you like, we are lagging behind the world trends which have changed our times. In this sense, the movement must indeed initiate its own renaissance, and I would even express the hope that it ought to start everything afresh.

My answer implies the following.

The world ought to be perceived in all its dimensions and movements—in the aspect of the present and the possible—so as to lay, on this basis and in line with need, a foundation for an interlinked and specific approach toward the development of the positive processes that have arisen and of changes which are needed but have not yet begun.

The movement perceives its activity as a synthesis of the opinions and interests of a pluralist world, always promoting common global interests to the forefront; promoting flexibility as a path for the convergence of objectively different interests at a given time; this also means more openness for dialogue with both East and West. Furthermore, this means actively striving for such a dialogue and opening up new channels for communication with all.

Of course, all this presupposes more practical and more pragmatic methods which would render the movement more active in the world arena and make it a more desirable partner for others while, on the other hand, ensuring that its proposals are more acceptable and its objectives are easier to attain. The start of this process will be made in Belgrade, but it cannot be completed and finally formulated at the Belgrade Conference. Surgery is just the beginning of an organism's restoration, and the organism subsequently needs time, the proper medicines, and its own strength. The movement does possess this vital strength.

[Gryzunov] To what extent does the Nonaligned Movement participate in the process of easing tension between existing military-political alliances?

[Loncar] Had you asked me for how long it has participated in this process, I would have answered: from the very beginning, but the process itself began later than this beginning. This is not just a play on words. Apart from any other reasons, did the movement not emerge because that was the time of the culmination of the "cold war" and the world's division into two opposite camps with growing tension between them? Thus, and throughout its existence, the movement has participated in the struggle for detente and peace all over the world, and this was profoundly reflected in the concept or vision of the world which the policy of nonalignment promoted as a real alternative.

The movement played a major role in this process not only because it anticipated such a detente on a long-term basis, but it also suggested a path leading to it; we are talking about more than 100 countries profoundly interested in seeing a steady decline of the tension existing between military-political alliances right down to the point where there will be no more artificial barriers or any danger of clashes; with its pluralist and democratic organization, the movement sets an example of the unity of countries despite their belonging to different civilizations, and regardless of their ideological stance, or their size and economic strength.

At the same time, we cannot fail to note that the movement is not all that enterprising or specific when it comes to solving problems which could promote the process of detente, and that the mechanisms for its possible influence are insufficiently developed. Unfortunately, there are instances of intolerance, clashes, and exclusiveness even within its own ranks.

These two answers are not mutually exclusive; they are actually in dialectical relationship.

[Gryzunov] How do you perceive the possibility of collaboration between the movement, and Yugoslavia as one of this movement's leaders, and the USSR?

[Loncar] This question was partly answered in my reply to the previous one. But I do think that this offers an opportunity to speak about the movement's relations with the USSR in the past. There is no doubt that the USSR, through its stance and interests, supported one of the chief directions of the policy of nonalignment in the postwar period—the anticolonial struggle. The USSR always rendered specific support to liberated countries, which found this tremendously important because their goal was to strengthen their independence. At times, however, this aid was unable to rise above the rivalry between blocs, it became transformed into a desire for influence, and led to hegemonism. All this inevitably introduced elements of ideology in the movement whose policy on the whole opposed the ideologization of international relations, and it also created situation which the movement had to deal with within itself.

The policy of new thinking in the Soviet Union has put everything in its proper place. This is why, in the new situation when awareness of the community of interests is predominant in relations between the blocs, this policy must become the determining factor and must rise above all ideological differences. From this point of view, the movement can only sincerely welcome the Soviet initiatives in the sphere of international security and the new and bold steps and actions proclaimed by the policy of perestroyka and new thinking.

[Gryzunov] How would you appraise the SFRY's contribution to the Nonaligned Movement's activity?

[Loncar] Speaking of one's own contribution is a thankless task. I always believe that this can only be done by others if they wish to do so, even though the question of total objectivity is always present. Therefore, let me just bring to mind only an historical series of facts which could be helpful in drawing conclusions.

The very idea of nonalignment, being the outcome of certain reflections and actions by countries from the so-called "third world," entered international relations in Brioni, Yugoslavia, in 1956 when three great leaders—Tito, 'Abd-al-Nasir, and Nehru—signed the General Declaration in their countries' names. It was in 1960, at the 15th UN General Assembly, that Yugoslavia, in the person of President Tito together with Presidents 'Abd-al-Nasir, Sukarno, and Nkrumah, signed the well known appeal to the great powers which helped to expand and enhance the importance of nonalignment. The first conference was held in Yugoslavia in September 1961, and this marked the movement's beginning. We participated in all subsequent summit meetings. We have also been constant members of the Coordination Bureau ever since its formation. Now we have once more been elected by a majority of votes to host the summit conference, the ninth so far, and to chair the movement for the next 3 years.

Being chairman of the movement entails major commitments. This is a complex job for Yugoslavia and especially for its diplomacy. It will not be easy to pool all interests and coordinate actions so as to ensure that every country achieve a comprehension of its particular inclinations within the policy of nonalignment and uses this policy as a prism to examine all its national interests. But democratic procedures offer the only path to be followed by the movement in the attainment of its objectives.

Andrey Sakharov Interviewed on Hungarian TV

LD0509034189 Budapest Television Service in Hungarian 1905 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Interview with Andrey Sakharov, Nobel Prize winning acamedician and nuclear physicist, by Geza Foldvari, permanent correspondent of Panorama in Moscow; from the "Panorama" program; first three paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] [Presenter] Our critics can expect a lot from us, except for lies, no matter how noble the ideas or in whose interest silence would be.

Essentially this is the conviction of Andrey Sakharov, Nobel Prize winning academician and nuclear physicist, who is often called the father of the Soviet nitrogen bomb and who spent nearly 7 years in exile in Gorkiy because he dared protest the Afghanistan intervention by Soviet troops. For years, the Moscow press described him as a political adventurer, anti-Soviet, an ideological subversive, a traitor to the motherland, a capitalist agent, the enemy of the people and the state. True, Sakharov had already been declared a heretic in 1968 for his economic and political reform ideas. The academician demanded the cessation of ideological censorship, a limitation of neo-Stalinist influence and the state monopolies. The heretic is one of the most consistent faithful of perestroyka today. He concluded an unannounced compromise with Gorbachev, although it does not prevent him from criticizing Gorbachev's domestic policy.

The 68-year old man, who speaks with difficulty, who breathes asthmatically, does not give statements with pleasure. In the past, he never gave an exclusive television interview to anybody—even now he does so reluctantly. The reporter is Geza Foldvari, the permanent correspondent of Panorama in Moscow. In the interview, Sakharov mentions the possibility of a right-wing turn several times. The term: right-wing turn, naturally means in the Soviet Union a conservative, Stalinist, fundamentalist turn.

[Begin recording] [Foldvari] Is it conceivable that Gorbachev could be replaced by somebody else, or, on the contrary, is it possible that a Gorbachev dictatorship could happen?

[Sakharov in Russian with superimposed Hungarian translation] In my mind, Gorbachev is the only realistic leader of perestroyka, whom we can take into account at present, and, therefore, a replacement for Gorbachev would be a catastrophe. Rather, it would mean a right-wing turn, a right-wing power takeover. Naturally, it must not be ruled out that some kind of new leader of perestroyka may appear, but as yet we don't see such a leader anywhere.

Let us now examine the issue of whether blackmail and such intrigues of right-wing forces can exert pressure on Gorbachev. Gorbachev once announced that he would not be frightened by any kind of blackmail. Whether this is really the case is very difficult to tell, naturally. He is a clever, determined man, but blackmail can always be feared and the extent of its danger must never be underestimated.

[Foldvari] Is a Gorbachev dictatorship possible?

[Sakharov] His personal dictatorship?

[Foldvari] Yes, although, in my view, Gorbachev's personality, his nature, his character rules out this possibility, according to indications.

[Sakharov] Yes, I don't think that this will happen.

[Foldvari] If perestroyka fails to bring considerable results within the next 2 to 3 years, will it mean the bankruptcy of perestroyka itself and moreover of Gorbachev himself?

[Sakharov] I cannot make such a concrete precise assessment, i.e. whether we are talking about 2, 3, or perhaps 5 years. What is beyond a doubt, however, is that if we continue to lack results, then it is very dangerous. This would mean our rolling back down the slope. But because—considering it in its entirety—perestroyka is unavoidable in terms of history, the shaping up of events in such a way would be a great misfortune for our country and for the whole world. Even history moves in this direction, because what has been built in our country, this Stalinist, administrative command regime, is a perfect blind alley.

[Foldvari] Naturally, this is not spoken about officially, but it is obvious that the Soviet Government is not united. Understanding between the government members is not there. Are those views about the weakening position of the pro-reform forces well-founded? Or does it weaken only when Gorbachev is not present?

[Sakharov] I think Gorbachev is holding on to power very solidly, but I cannot say whether there is currently a strong resistance to him at all within the Politburo. At least at the congress no such anti-force was observable; in my judgment, such an anti-force simply does not exist. In my view, Gorbachev's position is considerably solid. He—as he said himself—also struggles, to some extent, against himself; like every great man, he too is contradictory.

[Foldvari] However, do people within the country trust him?

[Sakharov] No, I must say that in recent months among the wide masses of people, the trust in Gorbachev has decreased very considerably, because people essentially look at the real situation, and—looking at it realistically—the situation has not improved. However, I think that we are talking about a temporary phenomenon. Or, more precisely, I hope that this is a transient thing. I think that the trust will be restored, but right now it has been shaken very much. It appears to me that in this respect, Gorbachev does not have a correct policy all the time. I hope that Gorbachev will overcome, at least I would like to (?believe it).

[Foldvari] Do you respect him? I know that he respects you.

[Sakharov] I respect him, and he, too, respects me. This is indisputable. But, I do not idolize him whatsoever. The fact that I respect him does not mean that in my view he always does what he must do or precisely when there is a need for it.

[Foldvari] Could you give an example?

[Sakharov] But, please, there is constant talk about this. There is a delay in everything; in nationality issues too, in the structural change of society and, in my view, realistic measures are in constant and very powerful delay.

[Foldvari] Perestroyka has now been going on for 5 years, and people today are worse off than at a time of stagnation.

[Sakharov] We have proceeded along incorrectly, but there is no return. However, nobody know what difficulties need to be overcome along this road. What's more, it might be possible that we will have to call a temporary retreat. We are precisely in the same situation as in the war: We know that we must win, but it is not known what sacrifices our victory will cost; it is impossible to say, nor do we know either. Gorbachev has said several times that he is against the big, leap-like changes, because history has proved that such changes lead to catastrophe and set back progress. Therefore, he is faithful to very gradual, cautious progress. I would agree with him, but life hurries us, and it is this which causes my anxiety.

[Foldvari] There are all kinds of rumors about what might happen to the country within 2 years, possibly even a famine.

[Sakharov] If chaos increases, these negative phenomena become more powerful. But it seems to me that this is only a part of the general crisis situation which exists in the country. For us to have more foodstuffs, an urgent reform of the village is needed, but these reforms are impossible to implement without political reforms and without an increase in the real power of [local] councils. People need to see a guarantee of the irreversibility of perestroyka, and reform of the village means, first of all, reform of the system of land ownership. A significant proportion of the land must be put into private hands or in the hands of a new type of cooperative, independent of the bureaucratic party structure. I myself have hope in the work of the individual, because in our relations it is this which can ensure the highest productivity. Because if the person himself has a personal interest in production, personally tends to his land, and is responsible for its maintenance, then this maximally [passage indistinct].

[Foldvari] [Words indistinct] in that the conflicts between nationalities are also sharpening. What is happening in the Baltics is a good example of this.

[Sakharov] It seems to me that the leaders of the Baltic republics are completely honest when they say that they are not thinking of seceding from the Soviet Union, and in my view the leaders of the people's fronts, who say the same thing, are also honest. That is a different question about secession from the Soviet Union, which is a right laid down in the Constitution, and, therefore in my view, it is incorrect to call the person who mentions this secession an extremist. I think that if the central power exhibits a negative behavior toward the processes in the Baltic republics, then these so-called centrifugal, disruptive forces will gain strength, despite the fact that in the current situation these forces have a rather insignificant role to play. If today (?the center) exhibits an unambiguous attitude toward the interests of these republics—and this applies not only to the Baltics but also to the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, and Moldavia—if the center takes a flexible attitude, then the moves to secede from the Soviet Union will not strengthen, because the people of these republics will have very important, realistic interests in remaining part of the Soviet Union and will not try to secede. This is why it is important for them not to be forced into taking this step. In my view, this depends to a greater extent on the central power today.

[Foldvari] Unfortunately, this kind of flexibility cannot be sensed in the expressions of the representatives of the central power and, what's more, it cannot be sensed in the Central Committee's statement.

[Sakharov] As long as rude [durva] statements, which reminds one of a rebuff, are made...[changes thought] the reprimand and threats create a bad relationship. I think that to make such statements is at best irrational, because these only make the situation more acute and strengthen precisely those processes which are unfavorable for the center. What's more, I'd say that such statements are even of a provocative nature to some extent. Yes, provocative, although it is possible that we are not talking about conscious provocation.

[Foldvari] Do you think some kind of intervention—to put it crudely—in the internal affairs of the Baltic republics will occur?

[Sakharov] Pressure is already being exerted.

[Foldvari] Is an armed intervention possible for example?

[Sakharov] Well, armed intervention is a very controversial [eles], difficult question. We can see that it is accompanied in every case by very serious, tragic consequences. I hope that the center will try to avoid it. However, so that the situation does not worsen, the central power must also exercise a more flexible policy.

[Foldvari] Is there a danger of such a crisis situation coming about in which a military takeover occurs? Many say that with an iron fist a strict order could be established everywhere: in the Baltics, in Moldavia, in the Transcaucasia, in Central Asia, in the economy, in society. So, do you think the danger of this exists?

[Sakharov] I would not like to think that such a danger seriously exists. I hope that the center will in the end find sufficient flexibility in itself so that it can take all those necessary measures in the ownership relations and in the power structure, whose delay was precisely the reason behind the agitation. For example, among the demands of the miners, political conditions also surfaced, i.e. the reduction of the jurisdiction of the ministries and the organization of such a system of management in the industry—we can extend this to the agriculture as well—in which direction takes place from below, through the lower level, at the initiative of the enterprise structures. In other words, they demanded the transformation of the system of direction in such a manner, and they also demanded the cessation of the monopoly of the party in the direction of the country; what's more, they wanted to see it happen through real deeds, not only in words.

[Foldvari] Moscow has officially rejected the Brezhnev doctrine. Have we really reached a stage that the principle according to which the Soviet Union does not interfere in the internal affairs of its allies will be firm and long lasting?

[Sakharov] I think that if in our country—considering it in its entirety—the normal political state of affairs survives, then this line will also remain firm. The present leadership keeps its promise, and in my view we can be sure of this; we can find evidence of this. However, if some kind of catastrophe occurs—and in our country a right-wing takeover of power is the equivalent of a catastrophe—then we cannot be certain about anything. However, I believe that this will not occur and that our progress will be favorable.

[Foldvari] How do you view the so-called Berlin-Prague-Bucharest axis which is forming in the socialist world? They even criticize the Soviet Union.

[Sakharov] I know that they criticize the Soviet Union, but I think that these forces have no future. Why? They were passed on here, forgotten from the past—at least I hope so.

[Foldvari] How do you view Romania's nationality policy?

[Sakharov] I think that what is taking place in Romania recalls not the past but times long-long past. The fate, the situation of the Romanian people today concerns me very, very much. However, the current Romanian policy has no future because, in my view, only with a more rational social progress, can life have a future. But as to how many bad things, misfortunes will take place until then, well, only the future, history can tell. Everybody lives in difficult circumstances in Romania; the clock of history follows a very different time there and to a different [words indistinct]. I think that presently there is no possibility for our having a say in what happens in Romania, but I hope that the situation there will not (?last for long). [end recording]

MSZMP Leaders Explain Party's Role

PM0109124789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Aug 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "On the Role of Party Organizations"]

[Text] Budapest, 30 Aug—A meeting has been held at the capital's Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] City Committee between MSZMP Chairman R. Nyers, party General Secretary K. Grosz, and delegates to the forthcoming MSZMP Congress. It touched, in particular, on the question of the adoption of the opposition proposal to end party activities at enterprises by the MSZMP delegation to political talks on coordinating interests.

In his speech R. Nyers said that Hungarian Minister of State I. Pozsgay, who represented the MSZMP at the talks, was authorized to adopt the proposal on the ending of party organizations' activities in the courts, the Prosecutor's Office, and organs of power. As for party organizations in the Armed Forces, it was considered possible to adopt a proposal aimed at removing them in the long term. Talking about party organizations at workplaces, in the MSZMP's opinion they should not be part of the structure of enterprises or constitute a second leadership. Mindful of this, R. Nyers stressed, I. Pozsgay, as leader of the MSZMP delegation to the political talks, was not authorized to adopt the proposal to end party organizations' activities at enterprises.

CSSR Embassy Counselor Cited on Perestroyka

18070746 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 29 Aug 89 p 3

[Article by Jozef Lapka, counselor at the CSSR embassy in the USSR: "At a Major Turning Point"]

[Text]**The 45th anniversary of the Slovak national uprising is marked on 29 August.**

Late in August 1944 the military units of the insurrection together with partisan detachments moved against the fascist invaders and their local underlings on the territory of Slovakia. The Communist Party became the leading force in the national-democratic revolution, heading the anti-fascist movement right from the start. Gradually it gained the support of the various strata of the population in its desire to restore national freedom and democratic transformations. The National Front, whose conception was devised by the Communists in the middle of the war, was the expression of that alliance.

Back in March the first partisan group, led by Pavol Boros had appeared in the area of Mikhaylovtsa. Other detachments were created in Little Carpathians, on the upper Nitra, and in Eastern Slovakia. Their numbers grew quickly. The Slovak patriots felt the support and help of the Soviet Union and its heroic army. A number of Soviet fighting men who had escaped after being captured, operated within the partisan detachments, and instructors specially trained for this kind of struggle were increasingly assigned to them. Soviet aircraft regularly delivered weapons, medicines and other materiel to Slovak territory.

According to the initial plan the uprising was to begin at the moment when the Red Army moved onto Czechoslovak territory. However, the situation changed after the fascist troops, with the agreement of the clerical-fascist regime in Slovakia, occupied its territory. As a response to this, the uprising began on 29 August 1944 and a considerable part of Slovakia was quickly cleared of fascists.

Right at the start the Slovak National Council took all legislative and executive power into its hands. Revolutionary democratic transformations were initiated on liberated territory.

For 2 months there was heavy fighting with the fascist troops, who had considerable superiority and had surrounded the territory involved in the uprising and managed to repulse the uprising back into the mountains. There the fighting continued in partisan form until the Red Army arrived.

The Slovak national uprising started a process in which the foundations of a new life were laid for the Czechoslovak people. It therefore remains a notable historical milestone in the history of the Czechs and Slovaks and their common statehood.

Today our society is living through an exceptionally important period. The scale and quality of the changes made in Czechoslovakia's public and economic life by perestroyka, which is gathering force, have opened up for us prospects that even recently were hard to imagine. The complexity of this time is that we are rejecting the old mechanisms while the new ones are still being formed. However, the existing shortcomings cannot be overcome by partial steps but only by achieving the realization of a set of measures. Perestroyka must be conducted in all spheres of life. It is a question of accelerating socioeconomic development and restructuring public life, and comprehensive democratization. All these fundamental questions will be considered at the 18th CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] Congress next year, for which preparations are now actively under way in the party and indeed in society as a whole.

One inseparable part of this will be submitting for national debate and internal party discussion in 1989-1990 the main directions for the economic and social development of the CSSR for the period 1991-1995, the principles of the CPCZ Program, and the draft of the CPCZ Rules.

The draft of the new party rules will also be submitted for consideration at the 18th CPCZ Congress. Hence, it will be a question not only of making additions and amendments. How will the decision be substantiated? First and foremost on the fact that the "fundamental law" of the party should be in line with the new conditions of party work and the new position of the party within society, as was emphasized in April of this year at the CPCZ Central Committee 9th Session. It is also planned to examine another document of fundamental importance at the highest party forum, namely, the principles of a new CSSR Constitution.

One integral part of the accountability-and-election meetings will also be the elections to the party organs. The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has adopted a decision that they will take place on the basis of secret voting and for a larger number of candidates than the maximum number of members set for the party committee. Two or more candidates may also be nominated for the elections of individual chairmen, first secretaries and secretaries.

The accountability-and-election meetings are not an end in themselves. The essential nature of them should be to activate the entire party and consider in depth the new processes taking place in society. Consequently, it is a question of making the party organizations the leaders in perestroyka within the limits of their competence, and of setting the tone.

The present economic situation requires the mobilization of all forces and reserves for the purpose of successfully meeting this year's targets. We shall not fulfill the planned aims and tasks without perestroyka of the economic mechanism, which includes first and foremost the entire system of planning, prices, and the credit and currency systems, and also organizational structures both in the central organs and in the production sphere. Along with resolving the urgent tasks we must lose sight of work on a long-term concept for the economic and social development of the CSSR, whose main section will be established for the ninth 5-year plan.

With the onset of social perestroyka and the deepening of socialist democracy, there has of late also been an activation of forces whose political orientation lies outside the sphere delineated by socialist pluralism of views.

As on more than one occasion in the past, today, too, with the help of certain political circles in the West and the mass media, some people are trying to organize the most diverse actions of pressure and create tension in society for the purpose of destabilizing the situation. The political principle of those forces is demagoguery and a desire to manipulate public opinion. They have been particularly active in their desire to take advantage of the lack of experience in some young people. They shun neither threats nor intimidation nor terror. These are very dangerous aspirations that must be decisively rejected and cut short.

As during the time of the Slovak national uprising, today, also, under the new conditions, enormous importance attaches to the patriotic activeness of our people and their ability and readiness to resolve complicated problems and tasks in what is a qualitatively new stage of socialist development. Therefore, perestroyka and the democratization of our society should be the concern of all Czechoslovak citizens.

This also requires of us a revolutionary disposition toward the culmination of this stage of our national liberation struggle, and a moral and political obligation to develop this legacy at this present major turning point.

Political & Social

Figures on Drug Abuse in USSR Reported

LD0609103189 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] In today's address to the nation, U.S. President George Bush underlined that the combat against the cocaine barons in Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia would not be effective unless in the United States itself drug abuse was stopped. He noted that the problem of drug abuse came up against the issue of demand and supply.

The U.S. President's words can be applied to any country where drug abuse exists, including the Soviet Union. Specialists estimate the drug market in this country at R300-400 million street value a year—this is roughly $700 million; 124,000 persons known to use drugs are registered in this country—out of this number, 70,000 are chronic drug addicts. The specialists estimate the total as several times higher. Drugs of organic origin—hashish, opium, and poppy stocks—dominate in the Soviet Union. The main areas where hemp is widespread are Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, the Far East, and the northern Caucasus. In the past few years there has been a rise in the use of medicines as narcotics. The main source of such medicines with narcotic properties are pharmacies, hospitals, and the manufacturing facilities.

After the ban on selling poppy in this country, there has been a rise in toxicomania. Such addicts use chemicals, the access to which is impossible to control even theoretically.

The growing demand and the prospect of getting rich have brought about the emergence of organized groups who harvest, process, and sell drugs. Several thousand persons have been arrested for this offense in the past few years. Last year about 23 tonnes of drugs and raw materials for making them were confiscated. At present, the sources for the supply of drugs in the USSR are only domestic, though attempts have been noticed to bring narcotics here from abroad.

The head of the Soviet Customs Service, Vitaliy Boyarov, has told the national daily PRAVDA that it is possible the international narco-mafia may try in the near future to exploit the Soviet market.

The problem of demand and supply also has social and psychological overtones. For a good reason, a sharp rise in drug abuse in this country was noted in the early 80's when an economic crisis began to be felt. The difficulties of daily life, as specialists believe, make a person take to drugs.

Unlike the United States, where there is the Drug Enforcement Agency, there is no single center of combat against drug abuse in the Soviet Union. This function is performed by about 50 government ministries and organizations. That is partly due to the fact that the problem of drug abuse is not as acute here as it is in the United States.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Perestroyka

LD0609092789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0815 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 6 Sep (TASS)—The progress of perestroyka opens up new prospects for Soviet foreign policy as it is directly linked to the country's domestic policy, Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister said in an interview with the weekly PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK.

"Undoubtedly, domestic difficulties have an effect on our foreign political affairs. We feel this even physically at negotiations. And, conversely, as soon as the situation begins to be rectified and it becomes much easier to work," the minister noted, "doubts still survive in the West as to the success of perestroyka and its reversibility and voices are heard warning against haste in responding to steps of one kind or another taken by the Soviet side, as if to say: who knows how things might change...it goes without saying that this, to a certain extent fetters the materialization of all the opportunities which, we believe exist today in the international sphere."

Speaking about the tasks of Soviet diplomacy, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that the main task is the creation of favorable foreign conditions for domestic perestroyka. "Diplomacy works for perestroyka; perestroyka and its authority and prestige work for diplomacy. The processes of renewal taking place in our country are making our partners in international dialogue more receptive to the new thinking and to Soviet foreign policy initiatives".

In the opinion of the Soviet minister, foreign policy is also having a positive influence on domestic affairs. "Affirmation of such principles as the primacy of law, the correlation between domestic laws and international law, the building of a law-governed state in general, and integration into the world economic system are in the interests of the people and perestroyka," Eduard Shevardnadze said. "This also applies to international cooperation in human rights, ecology, and safe operating procedures at nuclear power stations. In giving impetus to building new international relations, we are creating the comfortable environment essential for positive domestic improvements."

Commenting upon the proposal made in a speech at a session of the Supreme Soviet concerning withdrawing so-called "political" ministries, primarily the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from the government and making them directly subordinate to the Supreme Soviet, Eduard Shevardnadze expressed the conviction that "ceasing to be part of the Council of Ministers, whatever the motivation, would not be beneficial to work". "We deal with many issues pertaining to our country's foreign policy activity in conjunction with other ministries and departments. If we need anything, it is a high degree of coordination and collaboration," the minister said.

Railways Minister Discusses Problems

LD0509213589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1744 GMT 5 Sep 89

[The "Tropical Interview" program; interview with USSR Railways Minister Nikolay Semenovich Konarev by political observer Aleksandr Tikhomirov]

[Excerpts] [Tikhomirov] Nikolay Semenovich, we were talking together here, next to this map, a month ago, and at that time you voiced the following idea in the interview: Don't disturb the railways, don't dare to touch them, and so on. Many people understood your statement in a distinctive fashion and letters have come into the editorial office saying how can one not touch the railways when there is so much disorder on them; how can one not criticize them—that's how people understood it.

[Konarev] Oh no, I didn't mean that. I meant that actions disturbing the normal process of movement of trains on the part of outsiders should in no circumstances be permitted, because this is connected with ensuring the safety of movement of both passenger trains and freight trains, and this is impermissible as a whole, and in world practice this stance is protected by law. This is curbed very severely. Nonetheless recently in our country such manifestations have taken place and at that time we talked about this in that broadcast.

[Tikhomirov] Down there in the south?

[Konarev] Yes, on the territory of the Armenian republic, in Megzinskiy Rayon, actions were carried out which disturbed the normal movement of trains and in the final analysis they led to the fact that we did not travel there, for almost 11 days. This contributed serious complications to the economy of the whole of the Transcaucasus.

[Tikhomirov] I remember that at that time I tried to compare the railways to the circulatory system of the human organism. Are there blood clots now, or is everything functioning normally?

[Konarev] Unfortunately there are, and very serious ones. You know about the events which took place, and which up to this moment have not ended, in Moldavia. At this time, on the approaches to the Moldavian Railway, on the Odessa, Southwest Railway, and on other railways, more than 100 trains are held up. They contain loads which are going for the needs of Moldavia, and for export, and I must tell you that it is simply without cause. I want to defend my point again: To strive for a solution to questions, interethnic questions; questions of settling those disputes which arise on this or that subject which has come to light in the sphere of democracy and glasnost, they should not affect the normal rhythm of the railways.

[Tikhomirov] You have in mind certain strike actions, is that true?

[Konarev] Yes, of course.

[Tikhomirov] And in Azerbaijan at the moment?

[Konarev] Under the influence of the Popular Front of Azerbaijan serious hindrances have been caused to the work of locomotive depots at Baladzhary, Dzhulfa, Kirovabad, and a number of others. Locomotives are not coming out to trains and trains are not getting off. About 300 trains are held up at approaches to Derbent, mainly Derbent, and trains are held up not only on the North Caucasus Railway. They are also being held up on the Pri-Volzhskaya Railway and on the Donetsk Railway and on the Southeast Railway.

[Tikhomirov] In line, end to end, correct?

[Konarev] They are standing end to end and simply-...[changes thought] Recently I looked and counted how many. I called it trains—it is 25,000 wagons, and what isn't in them! There's both grain there, and there are both consumer goods there, and coal, and timber—more than 1,000 wagons with timber; more than 400 wagons with cement. Such phenomena should not take place. This is impermissible.

[Tikhomirov] Nikolay Semenovich, in this way you are refusing railway workers the right to strike—is that right? In that case it is probably simplest of all and most logical of all to adopt some kind of railways law, on the railways. Don't such drafts already exist?

[Konarev] I think that it is necessary to adopt a law or a decree, and as quickly as possible, on not permitting strikes at enterprises of railway transport.

[Tikhomirov] Nikolay Semenovich, this is a sufficiently responsible statement. Thousands and thousands of railway workers can see you at this moment. You are virtually refusing them the right to strike in expressing their demands.

[Konarev] In this connection I think that the railway workers themselves, and the collectives, are giving the right answer to this question. I have talked about the Novosibirsk people. They travelled there. There were people's deputies there also. They said that we understand that we should not go on strike. We understand what the Transsiberian main railway line means. It is the only main rail line which links the entire country with the Far East. I was very happy about such intelligent awareness and understanding of nationwide duty, but at the same time I understood how great our responsibility is in satisfying those demands which they present, and I pledged myself and all of our comrades, and that is what I told them—we conversed for a long time—that we will do everything in our power to satisfy your demands, but

I ask you not to resort to actions which may disrupt the movement of trains. And, so, as this is the second time you have asked me the question of whether the workers are being deprived—no. I appeal to intelligence. I appeal on that basis, not on the basis of banning, that must not be done. But this makes it incumbent on all territorial organizations and all-union organs, of course to do everything to satisfy the modest demands made by transport workers. [passage omitted]

[Tikhomirov] You are referring to economic demands. But you yourself said that those manifestations, the participation of railway workers in the strikes taking place in Moldavia today, which took place in Estonia, and which are taking place now in Azerbaijan are political in nature. How do you see it? That the whole republic strike except the railway workers?

[Konarev] Because the railway workers are fulfilling a function which reflects the interests not only of that republic. You remember what Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said—and, by the way, it would do no harm to talk about this seriously now and to talk about this loudly. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin said, immediately after the revolution, that the railways are extra-territorial in essence and that interference in their activity by local organizations was not permissible. [passage omitted]

[Tikhomirov] But can one really go back to how things were during the war and after the war? I remember that there were very special conditions then. The railway police walked around in their orange caps and bearing sabres. There were very severe railway rules, departmental guarding of trains and so on.

[Konarev] I look at it this way: That the times dictates the needs and evidently at that time precisely those things were dictated by the interests of the state and of the people that you have described.

[Tikhomirov] Are the same things dictated today?

[Konarev] Today there is no need to repeat in full what there was before, but I think that everything that was good could be made use of.

[Tikhomirov] Quite a lot of the comments in the discussion of your candidacy for the post of minister, at the Supreme Soviet session, accused you of adherence to the administrative command style.

[Konarev] I do not agree with this. If we make demands, that does not mean that we are issuing commands. I would not describe The style of the work of the railways as command administrative, but as directive efficient. I think that in medicine or in the educational processes commands are superfluous; however, in our area the circumstances are such that directives must be fulfilled.

[Tlikhomirov] All right, thank you. Then let me put some pressure on you. We have known each other for some years and I would like to ask you some questions which many thousands of television viewers are dying to ask. Why is there so much disorder in passenger traffic, why are there such lines at station ticket offices in the summer period, why is there such poor service by conductors in the coaches?

[Konarev] I think that here a great deal depends on the individual. [passage omitted] a great deal depends on the personnel and we are not working as we should. our personnel is letting us down in this area. [passage omitted]

[Tikhomirov] Well, in summing up our conversation, I would say that the country's railways reflect the economy's imbalance. Nikolay Semenovich, will you manage to transport enough fuel? Will we freeze in the winter?

[Konarev] We shall transport the fuel without fail. We are doing everything to ensure that the national economy works normally. But there is a large lag and therefore in September and October it is necessary to work very hard. And we hope that in this period there will be major changes in the treatment of wagons by all who use them. This year we slowed down the turn-round of wagons by 7 hours and do you know what losses this caused? Half a million wagons—that has been the loss of resources, of loading resources. and what is half a million wagons? It is 25 million tonnes of freight. Simply because of slowing down the turn-round of wagons. [passage omitted]

[Tikhomirov] Thank you, Nikolay Semenovich.

[Konarev] You are welcome.

Estonian Official Discusses USSR Relations

AU0609072389 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 4 Sep 89 pp 163-164

[Unattributed interview with Lennart Meri, co-founder of the Estonian Popular Front: "A Hostile Colony"—date and place not given]

[Text] DER SPIEGEL: One year ago, the Communist Party of Estonia and the Popular Front called for economic independence. Now they are demanding a referendum on national independence. Why this escalation?

Meri: Estonia has become a bulwark of perestroyka. The political and social processes have developed more rapidly here than in Russia [Russland]. This has aroused the suspicion of conservative forces in Moscow....

DER SPIEGEL: Who are these forces?

Meri: The central ministries. About 6 months ago they started a virulent campaign against Estonia in their mass media, claiming that there are extremists here, that there have been clashes, nothing but a pack of lies.

DER SPIEGEL: How did the Estonians react to this?

Meri: We have realized that we cannot create a joint policy with these people, who would still like to represent a colonial power.

DER SPIEGEL: Will there be a referendum?

Meri: If it is the only possibility of reestablishing democratic Estonia, this referendum will and must take place—provided Russia really acts like a democratic, law-governed state.

DER SPIEGEL: Who will qualify to cast their votes in this referendum?

Meri: All citizens of Estonia, apart from the Soviet Army. Up to now, the garrison has taken part in all elections. We have a population of 1.6 million. If three to four divisions are moved here for 1 week, a total of 60,000 men with the right to vote, the referendum makes no sense.

DER SPIEGEL: If only the Estonians were asked, the result would be clear.

Meri: Yes, because after all the Estonians have a right to self-determination, as have the Algerians or Namibians.

DER SPIEGEL: What about the 600,000 Russian, Belorussian, and Ukrainian immigrants? How would they vote?

Meri: To claim that after a referendum or in a subsequent democratically constructed Estonian state we would kick out all the Russians is nothing but lies. Even the Estonian Independence Party, ERSP, which the conservative press in Moscow describes as extremist, takes a clear stance: Every individual living in Estonia has the right to continue to live here, as is normal in the civilized world. The former Republic of Estonia was and continues to be a classic example of generous cultural autonomy for all nationalities. We have never had any problems in this connection.

DER SPIEGEL: Is it still possible to avoid a withdrawal from the USSR?

Meri: About 1 year ago it would still have been possible. At that time there was an optimistic upswing here and we saw a chance to reestablish real European parliamentarism, pluralism, freedom of the press, and above all the right to self-determination, as well as a possibility for the survival of our people and our culture.

However, now the conservative colonial monopolies in Moscow have reacted so fiercely that it will hardly be possible to avoid the referendum. The only means at our disposal are the means of parliamentarism.

DER SPIEGEL: Would Moscow accept the result, namely a declaration of independence by the Baltic states?

Meri: Such a declaration would even be in the interest of Russia, because it is better to have friendly neighbors in the Baltic than a problem area, a hostile-minded colony.

DER SPIEGEL: What kind of neighbor would you like to have in the East?

Meri: We will do everything to avoid threatening the process of democratization which was initiated by Gorbachev.

DER SPIEGEL: However, by seceding you would pose a threat to the reformers.

Meri: No, we are implementing democracy, because we would also like to experience the rebirth of democratic Russia.

DER SPIEGEL: Rebirth?

Meri: After the Russian Revolution of 1905 until World War I, there was a time in which there existed a very good Russian press, the legal practice was comparable to that in England, there was a parliament, which may not have been very democratic, but which was good training. The result was the quick development of the entire Russian national economy. These were the years of great hope for Russia.

DER SPIEGEL: At that time the Baltic states did not consider leaving the Russian Empire. Now one can really hear people say: Russians out.

Meri: Can you see anything here that one could call a crisis, or a conflict between Estonians and Russians?

DER SPIEGEL: The leader of Interfront, who wants to represent the interests of the Soviet minority, said that all Estonians are fascists. The planned election law limits the rights of Soviet immigrants. What is the definition of a citizen of Estonia?

Meri: All those who were citizens of the Estonian Republic prior to the Russian occupation. Secondly, all those who live in Estonia and who want Estonian citizenship [Buergerschaft].

DER SPIEGEL: What about those Russians who live here, but who do not want to become citizens of Estonia?

Meri: They can continue to live here without any problems and with guaranteed cultural autonomy.

DER SPIEGEL: As second-class citizens, comparable to the Turks in the FRG...

Meri: ...where there are mosques, Turkish schools, Turkish kindergartens—this is part of the civilized world. The Turks can even obtain FRG nationality. There can be no other solution, because we want to establish real democracy.

DER SPIEGEL: Even if this were to result in the disintegration of the USSR?

Meri: This is most unlikely; at least we want to avoid it. The difference between us here in the Baltic area and the other USSR republics is that the three Baltic states were divided up between two imperialist superpowers, Hitlerite Germany and Stalinist Russia, and that they continue to be the only colonies in Europe to date. We can no longer accept that. My childhood is linked with

Germany and Russia, and I love these countries, but today the Estonian's right to self-determination comes first.

DER SPIEGEL: Do you see the future only outside the USSR?

Meri: Historically, our mission, here at the edge of the Baltic Sea, has always been to play the role of a great bridge and cooperate with many peoples, in which we Estonians have acquired much experience over the centuries. Thus, it is alien to the character of the Estonian people to isolate themselves from others. Our future can only be in a world which is accessible to us, to the east and west, north and south.

DER SPIEGEL: Do you see the future as a state within or outside the USSR?

Meri: I see it within Europe.

'Mutual Understanding' Sought in Tallinn

LD0509220589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Video report from Tallinn by correspondent Igor Kudrin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Video opens with a view of Tallinn's historical center, cuts to show street scenes] This is Tallinn on an ordinary working day. As always, the atmopshere in the center of the Estonian capital is noisy and lively. Passers-by are hurrying about their everyday business, the cars on the highways are driving nose-to-tail, the work in the port is in a full swing, there is the usual bustle at construction sites. [video shows a view of a port]

It is difficult to believe that last summer Tallinn went through several complicated days having endured a strike—a phenomenon which is new for it. Various data with regard to the scale and consequences of the strike are cited, but the fact is that in the republic more than 50 enterprise stopped work, the strike encompassed 80,000 people and caused considerable damage. After all, the factories did not work, the port installations were unusually quiet, a part of city's transport did not set for its daily journey, the railwaymen and some of the construction workers joined the strike. [video continues to show street scenes, focusing on roads and construction sites]

It is no secret to anyone here that it was mainly the Russian- Speaking workers who were on strike. They have lately been developing—and not without grounds—a feeling of defenselessness and uncertainty in tomorrow. The strike did not last long. In a desire to extinguish the conflict as quickly as possible, the Estonian leadership started talks with the republican strike committee. The purpose of the dialogue was to stabilize the political situation. [video shows people walking along the streets, a small group of people gathered in front of a building] And here is a routine day of their meeting. Representatives of the strike committees are gathering at the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium building. [video shows a building decorated with the Soviet state emblem, a group of people entering the building, a meeting in progress] A discussion on how to successfully solve a number of political, economic and legal problems, continues. The dialogue is proceeding in a tense manner and with delays for which the two sides blame each other. There are clashes on various viewpoints, differing approaches to the elimination of the conflict situation are coming to light [video continues to show the meeting where animated and noisy discussion is under way] But all are united on one thing: unyielding and intractable attitudes should not arise. It is obligatory that a common language should be found and it is indispensable to reach concord and mutual understanding. This is in the interests of the whole republic, of its all population irrespective of the language spoken.

There is now a short interval in the session. I am interested in the views of each side. [video shows a group of men standing outside in a park: M.I. Lysenko, chairman of the strike committee, identified by caption, talking to camera]

[Lysenko] The final law on elections to local soviets, which restricts the rights of the Russian-speaking population, was a spur to the strike. A total of 80,000-100,000 inhabitants will be restricted; they do not have the right to vote and to be elected. That is how I would put it.

[Kudrin] This means that the strike has a political nature?

[Lysenko] It has precisely a political nature, although they are trying to push us away from a political strike by all available means and to show that our strike is not political but economic. But this is not the case, our strike is precisely political.

[Kudrin] I am forming the impression that there are some forces in the republic which simply wish to deliberatly bring two peoples to a collision.

[Lysenko] You should understand that forces like these do exist. In the first place I could name the Popular Front and the National Independence Party, the civic committees of Estonia which are shouting on every street corner that Estonia should be for the Estonians, that the Russians have nothing to do here, that they should go back to their homeland. [video cuts to show interview with R. Sookruus, deputy chief of a department of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia, identified by caption]

[Sookruus] The dialogue is proceeding in a rather difficult way and meanwhile one cannot as yet speak about any concrete results. But, nevertheless, I think that the main thing is that the dialogue is being held. The situation would be worse if we suspended the talks; the strikes would then be resumed. Nobody needs this and we understand that it is necessary to conduct a dialogue and that it is necessary to seek compromies, although I can say that every day—(?that is three times) a week—we (?meet) here for 5, 6, or 7 hours. So things are not proceeding easily.

And as you could see today, we have again resumed a group discussion of questions on ideology and interethnic relations because we think that everybody should make their own contribution so that the situation in Estonia will stabilize, so that all forces, which in reality now participate in our political life, are able to stabilize the situation. You can see that it is very easy to drive matters toward destabilization and that it is much more difficult to move toward stability.

Estonian Deputy Views Economic Reform Prospects

PM0509151289 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 1 Sep 89 p 11

[USSR Supreme Soviet and Estonian Supreme Soviet deputy Juhan Aare 'Focus' article: "Help Us To Get an Estonian Krona!"]

[Text] In a SVENSKA DAGBLADET "Focus" article 25 August Swedish Liberal Party leader Bengt Westerberg proposed that Sweden should grant Estonia a loan. I had already heard rumors of the proposal when a group of leading Swedish businessmen and bankers visited Estonia recently.

In Estonia the visit was seen as yet another sign of the interest in Estonia that has recently arisen in Sweden. The visit produced concrete results in that Nordstjernan board chairman Bo Axson Johnson spontaneously gave half-a-million kronor to a fund to enable Estonian researchers at the Tallinn Technical Institute to engage in further studies at the Stockholm Technical Institute.

I know that the proposal put forward the other day by Bengt Westerberg in SVENSKA DAGBLADET has been the object of great anticipation in Estonia. It had already won the support of representatives of all the leading political groupings in our country. It only remains to be hoped that it will win similarly broad support in Sweden.

It is difficult to imagine better support for the renewal process in Estonia and the rest of the Baltic region. The proposal probably also increases the Moscow authorities' interest in giving Estonia and the rest of the Baltic region the economic autonomy which has been approved in principle—and which in turn is the prerequisite for the continuation of the peaceful process of renewal in our country and consequently for the preservation of stability in the region around the Baltic Sea.

I saw Westerberg's article on the same day that I arrived in Sweden to take part in the major environment congress, Ecology 89, in Goteborg. The article contained a great deal of information that was new to us Estonians. Particularly sensational was the report that neutral Sweden handed over our Estonian gold to the Russian state bank even before our country was incorporated in the Soviet Union.

I do not doubt the correctness of the Swedish parliamentarian's assertions. But you scratch your head and wonder how it was possible. How could a neutral country hand over another country's property to a third country? Was might really synonymous with right for the Swedish government of the day?

In Estonia and the rest of the Baltic region we have recently condemned in a major demonstration the agreement between the dictators of the day, Hitler and Stalin. Only by condemning yesterday's violence and injustices can we build a more peaceful world for tomorrow. But what does Sweden intend to do to make amends for the injustice which took place when our Estonian gold was handed over?

Since we knew nothing about the circumstances revealed in the SVENSKA DAGBLADET article, we are also wondering how much the gold that was handed over was worth. Perhaps it could be the first instalment of the Swedish loan which Bengt Westerberg proposes.

It would represent major support for our economic liberation if other parties backed the Liberal Party leader's proposal. It would show the authorities in Moscow that they too have something to gain from allowing us in the Baltic region to leave the centrally controlled command economy in which none of us has any faith any more and to make the transition to a market economy open to the rest of the world. A Swedish loan could be just the support we need to be able to reach a decision in the Estonian Supreme Soviet to introduce our own currency, an Estonian krona.

We ourselves are convinced that our program for economic self-government is also in the interests of the Nordic countries and the Soviet Union. Once we had living and production standards that were as high as Finland's, and almost as high as Sweden's. Since then a gap has opened up between our countries, but it can be closed again if we are given the opportunity to liberate all our creativity and exploit our resources. In this way we would also be an experimental economic zone for the whole of the Soviet Union and an economic bridge between East and West—just as Westerberg writes in SVENSKA DAGBLADET. He is also right when he writes that the changeover will be difficult and that we will need support from outside during the changeover period. That is why a Swedish loan would be valuable for us.

It was also news to me that the 1924 Swedish loan to Estonia chiefly aimed to increase the chances of sales of Swedish agricultural machinery—and that the loan itself was very successful in this respect. A Swedish loan today would probably largely be used to acquire Swedish environmental technology to be used to save the Baltic Sea, which is our common inheritance. Would not this be a worthy field of cooperation between two old neighbors on the Baltic?

Estonian Front Aide Sees Conservative Backlash

PM0409110789 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 31 Aug 89 p 5

[Report on interview with Estonian People's Front leader Klara Hallik by Elisabeth Nordgren: "System on the Attack Against Perestroyka"; date, place not given]

[Text] "The system is hitting back and is on the attack against perestroyka."

That is Klara Hallik's view of the tough criticism which the Baltic states had to take last Saturday from the CPSU Central Committee.

Klara Hallik, people's deputy for Estonia, party member, member of the leadership of the People's Front, and a researcher on nationalities issues, considers that this new move by Moscow is simply a logical result of recent developments in the Soviet Union.

"As long as perestroyka dealt with general questions it was left in peace. But now that perestroyka is coming ever closer to a concrete plan and actual reforms the conservative forces are emerging in defense of the system.

"We have been used to the terminology which the Central Committee uses in its declaration since last summer, when Interdvizheniye [International Movement] emerged in Estonia," Klara Hallik said. "But it is remarkable that we have been accused of nationalism, fascism, extremism, and even of separatist aspirations," she added. "Interdvizheniye's most reactionary faction has been enriching our political life with such terminology for over a year.

"That is why it is shocking that the party's Central Committee should use such words in its declaration. We are perplexed because this declaration does not agree at all with the theses on nationalities questions recently published in preparation for the forthcoming plenum.

"People are now asking whether we have two separate parties, two different Central Committees? I at any rate am absolutely sure that this declaration is a demonstration by those forces opposed to perestroyka; that is shown by the maneuverings now taking place in the Baltic countries and by the attack on the people's fronts.

"Since I have closely followed the development of perestroyka in Estonia for several years I can say with certainty that there is no organized Estonian extremist movement. In Estonia it is more a case of individuals, small isolated groups who are unable to take a realistic view of the political situation here.

"And Moscow is not without its divisions. It has movements that are close to the Baltic people's fronts and also people who are prepared to criticize us. When you talk about our people's fronts you should also remember that they are not political parties. That is why they contain people with differing views and various factions, more or less moderate."

In a few weeks' time the Supreme Soviet in Moscow will convene. That is why it is important now to tackle more positive things, according to Klara Hallik: the implementation of the IME program (economic self-management), the renewal of local government, and the transfer of power to the soviets.

Latvian Group Wants Full Political Independence

AU0509145889 Paris AFP in English 1436 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, Sept 5 (AFP)—The Popular Front of Latvia will call for full political independence from the Soviet Union in its new programme to be formally adopted by its congress in early October, Popular Front spokesmen said Tuesday.

The new programme, drafted by a 15-man commission over the past month, will officially be published next week, Int Upmatsich, a spokesman for the mass movement formed 18 months ago, said in a telephone interview from Riga.

One of the front leaders, Dainas Ivans, had said last week that the new programme would call for "the struggle for full economic and political independence," rather than moves on the path towards such a goal.

The programme will also demand that the Baltic state now be given a special status in the Soviet Union, marking its transition from a Soviet republic to an independent state, as existed prior to annexation by Moscow in 1940, Mr. Ivans added.

The Latvian Popular Front has informed the Estonian and Lithuanian Popular Fronts about its new programme proposal, but did not consult with them over its elaboration, Mr. Upmatsich said. The other two popular fronts have so far avoided officially calling for all-out political independence from the Soviet Union.

The Latvian Popular Front congress is due to convene in Riga on October 7 and 8.

The Latvian Popular Front, which claims 240,000 members and 300,000 supporters out of a total population of 2.7 million, will support candidates backing its own platform in next December's local elections, Mr. Upmatsich also said.

The Popular Front, which acts as an umbrella organisation for about 30 societies, from the pro-environmental to the semi- political, also says its membership includes 40,000 of the 170,000 members of the Latvian communist party.

Current Mood in Latvia Described

PM0509134989 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Sep 89 p 3

[V. Knyazev report: "Looking for Ways Toward Concord"]

[Text] Riga, 4 Sep—There is no outward sign of social tension in Riga. Numerous tourists still visit here, you will not see reinforced militia details or military patrols on the streets, fresh flowers lie on the Lenin Memorial, all enterprises and establishments are working, the Pskov Dramatic Theater is opening its season, a bountiful apple crop has ripened in the orchards, and children have started classes in good spirits.

But you only have to start talking to people—whether they be Latvian, Russian, Jewish, or from another nationality—to become aware of their inner tension and concern about the republic's future and the cause of perestroyka. There are opinions enough of all kinds, including opinions on the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Baltic Republics. This document has been received with special anxiety and heartfelt pain in Latvia. The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau notes that manifestations of separatism and also anti-Soviet, nationalist, and chauvinist feelings have indeed occurred in the republic.

One confirmation of this is the Riga City Executive Committee Internal Affairs Administration report that on the night of 22-23 August unknown hooligans painted anti-Soviet and anti-Russian slogans expressing disrespect for society and insulting the national dignity of part of the population on the walls of a number of state establishments and on fences in the city's central districts.

At the same time a group of USSR people's deputies and Latvian Supreme Soviet deputies is voicing via the local press its disagreement with the—in their opinion—biassed description of the political situation, which disinforms the Soviet Union's population and the world public and hampers perestroyka in the republic.

I find it difficult to say how far this standpoint corresponds to their electorate's opinion. I have something else in mind—how is the appeal of the Latvian People's Front Duma for "full" political independence understood? The act of forming citizens' committees to counterbalance the soviets and the attempts thereby to create a dyarchy? How are the ideas of introducing a residential qualification and a republic currency regarded? In my presence a girl store assistant embarrassedly refused to sell a war veteran on vacation in the republic a basic everyday item—a pair of socks.

One can cite other cases. V. Stinkulis, chief of the memorial museum, has already been forced to defend—can you imagine whom?—the Latvian Red Riflemen! "Latvian Riflemen in general and the Latvian Red Riflemen in particular have recently been censured in the press and more often at rallies and even in churches," the author writes in the republic newspaper, CINA. "It has become virtually good form to reproach and condemn everything that is 'red.' You get the impression that a specific social imperative is being fulfilled."

The painting out of Russian-language signs, the appearance of nationalist placards, and the picketing of streets are put down to some kind of childish pranks. And we have already heard officials suggesting closing down the republic Russian-language newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA....

Nevertheless, perhaps it is worth heeding the words of A. Klautsen, Riga city party committee first secretary and USSR people's deputy, expressed on the pages of that newspaper. Assessing the current situation, he said bluntly: "We are at a new stage. But on the other hand, there is the danger that this new stage will be undermined by the activity of extremist forces encouraging hostile attacks upon the party, our socialist state, and the unity of the country's fraternal republics."

Finally, let us look at ATMODA, the information bulletin of the Latvian People's Front. It recently published a draft constitution for the Republic of Latvia. As its authors acknowledge, it was drawn up on the basis of the common principles of the constitutions of states like Sweden, Italy, France, and others. For that reason it is perfectly understandable that there is nothing in the draft about the fact that Latvia is a socialist republic and forms part of the USSR. A certain Yanis Rukshans goes even further in an article entitled "Is there an alternative to Latvia's Independence?" in the same issue of the bulletin and proposes nothing more nor less than closing the republic's borders and introducing strict customs and passport control.

The position adopted by many labor collectives is constructive. Workers of various nationalities are plainly and openly stating that nothing divides them. They are ready to work selflessly to overcome the crisis in the economy, to create a new quality of life for people, and to cooperate with and support those social organizations and movements which favor a radical renewal of socialism and revolutionary perestroyka.

The just concluded Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum urged Communists and all working people of the republic to implement the economic, social, and political transformations through their creative labor. However, one is also bound to see, the Central Committee reminds people, that the situation in Soviet Latvia has remained difficult of late because of the actions and appeals by representatives of certain social formations designed to serve their own inordinate political ambitions. This is a reality, and it must be taken into account.

Latvian Party's Vagris on CPSU CC Statement

LD0509224689 Riga in Latvian to Europe 2005 GMT 3 Sep 89

[From the "Amber coast" program]

[Text] After several tense days, when many inhabitants of the republic followed the processes in the circles of Latvia's Communists, Janis Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, appeared in an hour-long "Standpoint of the Leadership" program on local television on Thursday evening [31 August]. He gave his assessment of the plenum and replied to the questions sent in and telephone calls to the television studio. The conversation was conducted by journalist Aldis Neimanis.

We include in our "Amber coast" program some excerpts of the replies given by Janis Vagris in the "Standpoint of the Leadership" broadcast.

[Begin recording] [Neimanis] Will Latvia have the right of veto on Central Committee decisions that are unacceptable to our republic? So then, well, a parallel is being drawn with the state's decisions?

[Vagris] Well, that is right. Well, I cannot give an answer to this question today. This is precisely the question that was left over, which we have to do, until the next, that is, until the congress, within a year. By adopting proposals on the status of the Latvian Communist Party, all these questions have to be discussed, and obviously, they must be included in our proposals. [end recording]

A large group of questions referred, of course, to the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Baltic region. Giving replies to viewers' questions in composed tones, Janis Vagris analyzed instances in which generalizations had been made in the statement on individual facts on the scale of the entire Baltic region, and which reproaches had to be received as well-founded.

It was mentioned that at the level of party leadership, brief telephone conversations had taken place on Monday with the candidate Politburo member Razumovskiy, and only about the initial reception of the statement in Latvia.

During the concluding part of Janis Vagris' appearance, questions were combined which could arise in connection with the statement in relations with the Army.

[Begin recording] [Neimanis] In our republic, perhaps not so loudly, but nevertheless, people express great anxiety in connection with this statement, and also in that television broadcast of Estonia it was asked whether, let us say, those people believe that some kind of armed forces could be brought in here, that this, well, statement is a hint that we will crush you by force.

[Vagris] Well, I think that if this, if this were done.... [sentence as heard] I think that this will not be done because, well, in my understanding, let us say.... [sentence as heard] It is difficult for me, you see. It is also difficult; I have no such full information about Lithuania, about Estonia. Unfortunately, yes? Probably this does no credit to me, but, well, that is how it is.

However, knowing the situation in our republic, well, well, I absolutely see no such need or necessity in general, or even—well, necessity probably is not the right word in this instance—that some kind, that there would be such a situation that this became necessary, that this should be done, yes? When [hesitates] and, that this would not be done because if this were done, that would mean that this was the end of restructuring. This would be to give up restructuring for lost, I mean, not only in the Baltic republics, but in the entire union.

[Neimanis] Do you think that also, shall we say, without some kind of request, shall we say, by our government and leadership, it certainly would not take place, either?

[Vagris] Well, I am once more saying no: I do not think that it would because I am saying, I repeat once more that well, in the name of the republic's leadership I can say that a request of this kind, if this concerns a request, let us say, there absolutely cannot be any talk today because there are no such circumstances, there are no such circumstances in order that, let us say, well, that that kind of an alarming situation, in order that there would not be, well, let us say, that people really would not perish on a mass scale, or something, well, if there were such a situation.... There is nothing like that, after all, so that, I think, that here we are able to pacify the television viewers that the republic's leadership, well, absolutely has nothing like that even in mind. [end recording]

Lithuanian Council Notes 'Anti-Baltic' Statement

LD0609015389 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Excerpts] In Vilnius, the Seimas [conference] of the Lithuanian reform movement Sajudis convened for its seventh extraordinary session today. Let me remind you that the previous session was held on 26 August. In the evening [words indistinct] that day the statement of the Soviet Union's Communist Party Central Committee on the situation in the Baltic republics was read on the central TV networks. Today it's known already that in Lithuania, just like in the other Baltic republics, the above statement has not met with great approval, even on the part of the local Communist Party leadership. [Passage omitted amplifying this point]

The Sajudis Seimas session was held today to discuss the political factors that might have provoked the statement, as well as the situation in the repuiblic after the statement's appearance. Chairman of the Sajudis Seimas Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, said that the Central Committee's statement is reactionary with regard to the restructuring process in the Soviet Union itself, but the most unexpected thing is, Landsbergis emphasized, that the statement is anti-Baltic, full of intolerance and jingoistic (?dart).

Dwelling further on the mainsprings of the document's appearance, Landsbergis said that psychological war was apparently intended to be declared against the Baltic republics. An attempt was made to intimidate and even disrupt the Baltic democratic movements.

The leader of the Sajudis Seimas assumed that ground was being prepared for a possible use of violence if such measures were decided upon. After all, Landsbergis said, by providing this biased information about the events in the Baltic republics to the Soviet Union's population they must have intended to rally the anti-Baltic jingoist forces, diverting their attention from the numerous problems in Russia.

All these questions no doubt remain unanswered today. Only during the second Congress of People's Deputies later this year it will most probably be possible to learn the real mainsprings of the document's appearance, and, what is most important, as the participants in today's session aid, its actual authors. [Passage omitted on Lithuanian people's hope for national rebirth, including the republic's national minorities]

No doubt there had been indecorous political outbreaks in Lithuania of late, but the actions of individual hooligans cannot be identified with the activity of Sajudis which enjoys almost all- round support. Sajudis disassociates itself categorically from extremist actions, Seimas deputies declared today. At the Seimas session the deputies expressed the hope that political wisdom would win over intimidation, threats, and blackmail in Lithuanian future too.

The last speaker in the debates at today's session, Algimantas Cekuolis, editor-in-cheif of the most popular Lithuanian weekly, compared the Moscow statement with the ultimatum of the Soviet Union's Government to Lithuania on 14 June, 1940, before the dislocation [as heard] of Red Army troops on its territory. There is however one essential difference, Cekuolis said. Namely that the 1940 ultimatum was a tragedy to Lithuania while the latter statement is a farce.

It's doubtful whether many people in Lithuania would be so outspoken about the Moscow statement but the appeal of the Sajudis Seimas to the people of Lithuania adopted at the session today says among other things: Lithuania is pursuing a far from easy road to a society of free people and a democratic state. The process that started in Lithuania in the June of last year can now be halted by physical force alone and only temporarily at that, the appeal by the Asjudis Seimas says. It warns that obstacles can be put up to the drive for Lithuania's independence. We must, therefore, be prepared to overcome all the difficulties. Lithuanian people have not been put off balance by the Central Committee's statement, the appeal goes on to say. This shows that Lithuania is bravely facing any trials. The Sajudis stand is backed by Lithuania which was proved by the signatures collected, by the elections and in the Baltic Way action. World public opinion is also favorable for us, the appeal states, and adds that the Central Committee's statement is not representative of the opinion of the Russian nation. The Sajudis Seimas ends its appeal with the words: the Baltic Way has become the symbol of our unity and independence.

Report on Strength of Sajudis in Lithuania Noted

LD0509214389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Video report from Vilnius by correspondent S. Chekalin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Chekalin] This is the headquarters of Sajudis, the most influential mass movement in Lithuania today, in the very center of Vilnius on (Prospekt Gidemina)—recently it was called Prospekt Lenina. [video shows exterior of a building] It seems that Sajudis has more opportunities to affect public awareness today than any other political or public organization in the republic: a periodical press with over 100 different types of newspapers and bulletins, a special program on republican television, "Wave of Rebirth" [Volna Vozrozhdeniya] lasting an hour and a half. It has at its disposal a printing press. The ideas of Sajudis flow out from here in a broad wave across the republic, the country, and even abroad. All the conditions have been created for it. Such is the democratic standpoint of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party—glasnost, equal conditions for all movements born in perestroyka. [video shows people looking at Sajudis newspapers, cartoon of Hitler and Stalin in bride and groom pose]

We wanted to interview the Sajudis leader today, but we were refused by a young man who said: In order to have a conversation you need at least a minimum of civilized things. You (?have no) intercourse with civilization, and so we do not consent to an interview. [video shows a man entering a corridor and being prevented from entering a room by a young man]

The alternative movement, Yedinstvo unites mainly the non- Lithuanian section of the population. It is smaller and less influential. For that reason we were surprised that the recently formed Committee for Defense of Soviet Power in Lithuania had gathered at its first meeting considerably more people than had a meeting held the day before under the aegis of Sajudis. We have decided to introduce our viewers to the new organization. [video shows run-down, dilapidated building; correspondent entering room in building]

[Begin recording] [A.S. Timofeyichev, member of the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Power, identified by caption] This committee unites all those forces which stand for the foundations of socialism, which are not confident in the future. With the situation which has come about in the republic, it is very difficult today to talk about our future. For this reason we have set up our committee with the aim of protecting our political and social rights. We have no confidence in the future. It unites party committees, secretaries of primary party organizations standing for the positions of socialism; it also unites representatives of Afghan servicemen, also the public organization Socialist Movement for Perestroyka in Lithuania, Unity, and also the Socialist Federation of the Working People of Lithuania.

[Chekalin] Judging from your past meeting, this movement promises to become a mass movement. Tell me, does it mainly unite Russian people?

[V.V. Ivanov, co-chairman of the Unity movement, identified by caption] What do you mean by that?

[Chekalin] Well, yesterday we were talking at the Central Committee, and we were told that there is a demarcation on ethnic lines, not on political lines.

[Ivanov] Not true. Our movement, the Socialist Movement for Perestroyka in Lithuania, does not have as its aim to divide people on ethnic grounds. On the contrary, it is an internationalist movement. [video shows correspondent chatting to group of about ten men in a room]

[Unidentified man] We Lithuanians had hoped that Sajudis would go along the right party [words indistinct] but what happened was quite different.

[Chekalin] What about these premises? Surely you could have found something better in the city?

[Ivanov] I want to say that it is good that we are still in these premises, because yesterday we received a letter saying clearly that they were simply clearing us out from here. At the same time we know that another movement, which stands for narrowly nationalist prerogatives, Sajudis, is being assigned a building, a palace, in which the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet used to sit. [video shows Ivanov brandishing a letter] [end recording]

[Chekalin] Well, I was probably mistaken when I said at the beginning that equal conditions have been provided here for all. I would like to say that the voice of each should be heard.

'Defense of Soviet Power' Group Holds Rally

PM0509150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Sep 89 Second Edition p 6

[Report by PRAVDA special correspondents Yu. Makhrin and N. Morozov: "Together and on Equal Terms. Rally in Vilnius"]

[Text] Vilnius—Yesterday PRAVDA gave an account of the Saturday rally in Vilnius. And here we are again, on Sunday, climbing the steep road to Pevcheskoye Field in Nagornyy Park. Two days and two rallies. The first with the blessing of "Sajudis," the second organized by the committee for the defense of Soviet power in Lithuania. Do you remember? The first one, declared international, took place beneath "national banners," not state. This time the flags of all the union republics are visible from afar, fluttering in the wind.

"The rally we attended was not not merely a question of pandering to fashion," comrade Pirogov, a worker from Snechkus, said. "It was anxiety about the political situation in the republic that brought us together. 'Sajudis' activists," he noted, "are trying to lull the public: There are neither extremists nor nationalists in Lithuania. So what are we supposed to think, for instance, when we are bluntly told to look for another job."

There was a recurrent theme in the speeches: Some party committees have lost their grip on the steering wheel and are no longer in control of the situation. According to one speaker, "gray ideology" is beginning to gain the upper hand. In no state in the world, speakers stressed, is any party built on ethnic lines. A document was read out at the rally in which the committee for the defense of Soviet power in Lithuania resolutely opposes a split between the CPSU and the republic's communist party. The committee proposes strengthening the current Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee leadership by coopting the best members of the working class and secretaries of primary party organizations.

V. Yelinskiy from Klaypeda demanded the determined replacement of party committee leaders who are unmoved by the tension that has developed in interethnic relations.

Many were alarmed by the fact that some party committees have lost control over their own press organs. V. Shved, first secretary of Oktyabrskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Rayon Committee, cited cases in which the editorial board of the paper VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI (organ of Vilnius Lithuanian Communist Party City Committee) had rejected materials prepared by the committee for the defense of Soviet power in Lithuania, while readily making room for "Sajudis" materials. Or take the following "trivial" detail: The rally organizers had the "For CPSU Unity" placard printed outside the republic—the paper was not available here for the order.

The speakers were of the common opinion that although the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Position in the Soviet Baltic Republics was somewhat belated and things had gone too far, the document could form the basis for a quest for agreement. USSR People's Deputy Ya. Tikhonovich proposed that representatives of all the movements hold a roundtable meeting.

But the situation will not be rectified by lulling and cajoling people, teacher S. Ionene noted. We need plain speaking. We are in favor of consolidation on the basis of socialist values. We will never side with nationalists, extremists, and chauvinists....

The rally did not pass without an emotional outburst. They were talking about "Sajudis'" suppression of pluralism, but when a representative of the Lithuanian democratic party (we were told that six new parties have now been set up in the republic) approached the microphone and expressed a view that differed from the opinions of the majority of rally participants, Pevcheskoye Field exploded into an angry protest which prevented the speaker from finishing.

As PRAVDA has reported, the first rally adopted two resolutions (one of them was cited twice by the newspaper). The participants of the present rally adopted a single resolution in which they share the concern voiced by the CPSU Central Committee over the way the social and political situation is developing in the Soviet Baltic republics. We are convinced, the resolution notes, that this statement will be a sound basis for the consolidation of all public forces, movements, and citizens seeking the socialist renewal of society.

On behalf of working people of different nationalities and social strata of the population of Lithuania the rally participants demanded that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet prevent the adoption of Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet laws and decrees to Lithuania's secession from the USSR and encouraging Lithuanian citizens to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces, and grant Lithuanian citizenship to inhabitants of the republic who are permanent residents on the day the draft law under discussion comes into force.

Two days and two rallies. Both called for concord, because, as one speaker rightly said, concord creates, whereas discord destroys. But on Saturday the dominant calls were for unity under "national banners," and on Sunday under the flag of the USSR. So, two rallies and two hearts.... Will they merge into one...to be together and on equal terms?

Lithuanian Trade Unions Issue Appeal for Calm

LD0509224289 Vilnius in English to North America 2200 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Excerpts] The Presidium of Lithuania's Trade Unions Council has made public an appeal to Lithuania's residents. [Passage omitted]

The appeal reads: We are concerned about the fact that some forces in the republic can, by their ungrounded actions in pursuit of political prestige and personal ambitions, block the way to the further progress of us all. In protest against the striving of Lithuania's people to speak Lithuanian in their republic, against the laws on Lithuania's citizenship, elections and (?referendums) under preparation, strike committees are being set up at some enterprises. Even heads of enterprises are amongst the initiators. Such committees are mostly established at enterprises of all- union subordination, or at those with mostly non-Lithuanian personnel. The Presidium of Lithuania's Trade Unions council comes out resolutely against such actions of political desperation which only incite passions and undermine the already shaky economy. The appeal calls for calm and businesslike discussion of the processes under way in Lithuania, for an objective and benevolent assessment of them. It expresses the belief that the sober approach and wisdom of Lithuania's residents will take the upper hand and all uncertainty and differences can be bridged by means of political dialogue.

Lithuanian Television News Editor Interviewed

PM0609084789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 7

[Interview with Vitautas Kvetkauskas, chief news editor of Lithuanian Television, conducted by own correspondent L. Kapelyushnyy under the rubric "Central Television's Colleagues Broadcast": "One Day's Diary"—first paragraph is journalist's introduction]

[Text] Vilnius—The events taking place in the Baltic today are perhaps the topic of most vital importance in the mass media. The processes taking place in the three Soviet republics are, of course, being covered by their television centers. What kind of television news does Lithuania get, for example? Your IZVESTIYA correspondent put this question to Vitautas Kvetkauskas, chief news editor of Lithuanian Television, the other day.

[Kvetauskas] The tour of the republic by A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, is attracting the greatest attention. Earlier it would have been the first item "for sake of protocol." But now, I stress this, it is because of viewers' interest. The party leader visited Mazheykyayskiy Rayon after the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, which discussed the CPSU Central Committee Statement. We carried live broadcasts from there. People's interest in the assessments and ideas generated by the Statement is enormous. The first secretary's next stop is Shyaulyay.

It needs to be said that by a decision of the plenum, members of the Bureau and senior officials of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee are currently meeting with labor collectives. We will be striving to describe those meetings in as much detail as possible.

[Kapelyushnyy] It was always difficult and awkward to cover the reaction to such events. What was to be condemned and what approved was always known in advance....

[Kvetkauskas] Thank god, those times are now past. We don't engage in prescribing opinions now. Those who want to share their ideas, hopes, and fears ring the editorial office themselves, and they are so numerous that we are simply unable to give them all space. But a balance of opinions giving an idea of public feelings does establish itself amidst this flow.

[Kapelushnyy] Are there any surprises?

[Kvetkauskas] Of course. One of our correspondents—she is a Russian who has lived in Lithuania just 6 months—responded very scathingly to the CPSU Central Committee Statement, the fear has even arisen among us that we may be blamed for organizing such opinion. While A. Klemaytis, general secretary of the Baltic Europarliamentary group, holds a quite different view. He regards the political realities in a different light.

[Kapelyushnyy] Does it figure in your plans to tell television viewers about the defiling of memorials to the war dead?

[Kvetkauskas] It does. This represents uprecedented barbarity and mindless vandalism for Lithuania. We have begun clarifying where this happened and who these monsters are. We have established so far that a tank was removed from its plinth. I don't know what governed the city authorities.

[Kapelyushnyy] Information about economic activity has for some reason or other diminished somewhat recently.

[Kvetkauskas] It has decreased, but, on the other hand, it has become more incisive. For example, we will be filing reports from Panevezhis, from the session of representatives of rayons and cities with representatives of the Council of Ministers and State Committee for Protection of the Environment of the republic. The topic is the construction of a plant for reprocessing industrial waste. Everyone says they are pro-ecology, the only thing is that they are refusing to construct the plant out of these considerations of preserving the environment. Meanwhile these harmful waste products themselves are being heaped up on the outskirts and concealed in woods and gullies....

In short, if you disregard the fact that reporters intend to investigate the activity of a bathhouse equipped with television and refrigerator that is off limits to ordinary citizens, there will be no "juicy" story...an ordinary working day with ordinary news items. An interesting discussion about autonomy at the "Venta" Association—the enterprise wanted to get out from under the ministry's wing but has met with a refusal. Why?.. The Trakayskkiy nonmetallic materials combine, which is operating on a lease contract, is, on the contrary, flourishing.... The peasants are completing their always difficult year.

Complex Situation in Baltic Republics Discussed

LD0409105789 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 3 Sep 89

[Text] The situation in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia still remains complicated. Our commentator Yuriy Rogachev writes:

The situation was aggravated by separatist statements and the actions of certain public forces in those republics. Many Soviet people in various parts of this country have seen in them a threat to perestroyka. For the conservative forces the situation in the Baltic area has become one more argument in support of their unwillingness to go further down the road of democratization. Voices are heard more and more often: This is what the policy 'you can do what you like' has led us to. Nothing of this kind had ever happened before perestroyka. This is true but in Stalin's years and in the period of stagnation any conflict of this kind was nipped in the bud with the help of the command methods. The supporters of such methods still exist in the country. But the policy of perestroyka has been launched here in order to replace the methods of dictating by democratic methods. The democratization of all sides of life including interethnic relations is perestroyka's major aim. This is why those who adhere to this line, and these people are in the majority in the country, see in the aggravation of the situation in the Baltic region a threat to perestroyka. To try to resolve the conflict with the help of command methods would mean to kill perestroyka. The statement issued by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party at the end of last week called on the people to understand and feel the extent of the dramatic situation. It called on the people to display responsibility and wisdom in the difficult situation and work towards consolidating the healthy forces in society for the work of solving the problems. The leadership of the Baltic republics and most of the Soviet people have taken an understanding view of (?this party's call). Local party organizations and work collectives are now discussing the party's statement. In Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia the leadership of the Communist Party has spoken against the separatist trend, for genuine sovereignty of their republics within the qualitatively renewed Soviet federation. It would be premature to speak about the evening of tension in the Baltic area, but writes Yuriy Rogachev, I cannot help but notice that the course of tranquility and well thought out action has been heeded by most of the people. Now they step on a difficult path of searches for a compromise of the consolidation of all the forces that give their backing to perestroyka.

Zhukov Discusses Western Media as 'Provocateurs'

PM0109164489 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 89 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Zhukov article: "Provocateurs: Who Profits From the Kindling of Nationalism in the Soviet Republics"]

[Text] The number one topic in the foreign mass media recently has been the events in the Baltic region and the question of the state of interethnic relations in the USSR in general. The articles and commentaries on this topic that are published there are far from uniform.

Statesmen and politicians, aware of the truly unpredictable consequences with which a further exacerbation of the situation in the said regions is fraught, call for restraint, and at any event, noninterference in other people's affairs.

Swedish Prime Minister Carlsson, for instance, spoke in this vein. "We should show caution and not draw hasty conclusions," he stated in an interview on 30 August. "We should seek to ensure that our actions promote new developments, rather than causing new difficulties."

Many newspapers—even some of those that usually adopt unfriendly positions with regard to the socialist countries—have now changed their tone, especially since the publication of the CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics. They have begun to speak of the abyss toward which the nationalists are pushing the peoples, and started calling for the alleviation of tension.

However, justice requires us not to forget that at the same time influential U.S. and NATO circles are continuing the irresponsible kindling of passions.

In this connection an article published in THE WASHINGTON POST on 31 August is noteworthy; it expresses disagreement with those who call for a "cautious approach" to events in the Baltic region. Its author, Jim Hoagland, writes: "If caution was useful at the beginning of the Bush administration's term, now events are continuing to develop. If we adopt a wait-and-see position, the United States could find itself unable to exert a direct influence (!) on the struggle for changes in the Soviet Union."

It appears that those who advocate active support for nationalist extremists enjoy a growing influence in the American media, in particular the Russian-language radio (which, as you know, is under state control). A similar picture can be observed with the radio stations of the NATO member countries. Since 22 August the topic of interethnic relations in the USSR has increasingly crowded out other Soviet problems in these radio stations' programs.

The volume of reports devoted to this topic as a proportion of the total Russian broadcasting by, for instance, Britain's BBC radio corporation has increased fivefold. A significant increase has also been noted in the broadcasts by Deutsche Welle and the Voice of America.

Persistent suggestions of "arguments" in favor of the Baltic republics' secession from the USSR are heard increasingly frequently in their broadcasts. The flareup of negative trends in the interethnic sphere is represented by them as "the start of an irreversible disintegration of the Soviet political system," evidence of the "collapse of communist ideology," and so forth.

Furthermore they go as far as incitement to armed struggle. Take, for instance, the sally by America's CBS television, which transmitted this "report" in its evening news program on Friday 25 August: **"You see on your screens people with pistols and revolvers in their hands," correspondent A. Pizzi reported from Georgia. "But this is not happening in the years of the 1917 revolution. It is happening in Soviet Georgia in our own day—in 1989. These young people are preparing for an armed struggle with Moscow for more rights to autonomy."**

It is striking that the provocateurs try with all their might to shift the responsibility for kindling interethnic discord onto Moscow, to the "center," to finally, the... Soviet media, first and foremost the PRAVDA editorial office. Any article in our newspaper, any commentary devoted to the events in the Baltic region, Moldavia, or any other union republic, is promptly misinterpreted, distorted, and presented to Western public opinion as a "threat," as a "call for violence," as "interference in the internal affairs" of the union republics.

Here are just a few examples: **"The newspaper PRAVDA today published an article sharply criticizing the Lithuanian people's front 'Sajudis,' one of the organizers of the protest demonstration... The sharp tone of the article, prepared by the ideology department, and the abundance of detail make it the most resolute attack so far." (BBC, 23 August.)**

"The CPSU Central Committee's organ, the newspaper PRAVDA, has attacked the Moldavian nationalist movement" (Voice of America, 28 August).

"In the central press, especially PRAVDA, the campaign of attacks on the Baltic republics is intensifying. This campaign uses every possible means, such as misuse of terminology, lies, and naive assertions about the injuries supposedly being inflicted on Russian inhabitants of the Baltic republics" (Voice of America, 28 August).

And so on, day after day. Naturally, these attacks on PRAVDA and other Soviet newspapers are not backed up by any facts, for the simple reason that none exist. Here a legitimate question arises: Why are they writing all this and transmitting it to the USSR by radio? Solely in order to provoke a further exacerbation of negative feelings with regard to the "center," turn people against the party press, and depict the extremists as innocent victims of the "center."

In whipping up the tension, certain foreign provocateurs go so far as to say that in the Baltic region, for instance, "preparations are under way for, in the worst case, a new Chile... Transport strikes have already flared up in Estonia, as in the period of Allende's rule in Chile. The opponents of the reforms are directing (this) campaign from Moscow." **(I quote an article by Andres Kyung [as transliterated], member of the board of the Swedish People's Party, published in the newspaper SVENSKA DAGBLADET; in his article he laments that "all this is happening while the Swedes sleep. But now the time has come to wake up.")**

As the proverb has it, "a hungry chicken dreams of corn"—certain people who dream of the revision of the territorial realities established as a result of World War II want the sorties of the Baltic separatists to pave the way for a revision of the existing borders in broader terms, and furthermore the possibility of the use of violent methods of struggle is regarded with astonishing unconcern.

In this connection a noteworthy article is published in West Germany's newspaper DIE WELT on 28 August: "How Far Will Moscow Go?" Touching on the observation made in the CPSU Central Committee statement that the situation that has arisen in the republics of the Soviet Baltic affects the vital interests of the entire Soviet people, the author of the article launches into the following reasoning: **"What 'vital interests' can the 'Soviet people' have in the Baltic region? How does Moscow plan to defend these 'vital interests' against the will of the people living there, if not by force? What does the term 'the Soviet people' ultimately mean here at all? There are Russians, Ukrainians, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Georgians, Armenians, Kazakhs, and many other people in the USSR, and they pursue the most diverse interests. The concept 'the Soviet people' is an invention from the times of Lenin and Stalin..."**

There you have it! As you can see, the gentlemen from DIE WELT allow themselves to call into question even the Soviet people's right to statehood, making it clear that they would far prefer the dismemberment of the USSR, which some people have long dreamed of. But has DIE WELT's editorial office forgotten where all that ended?

The CPSU Central Committee statement on the situation in the republics of the Soviet Baltic speaks with blunt directness of the serious consequences that could result from the further intensification of the negative processes in the Baltic region that are being encouraged and supported in every way by the foreign provocateurs. This could go as far as direct interference in the life of the Baltic republics, something the Western special services have already done in the postwar years.

In Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania now a complex, difficult process of interpreting the existing situation and seeking a way out of it is under way. And those foreign forces that seek by means of their statements to hamper the normalization of interethnic relations that is so necessary at the moment are assuming a grave responsibility for the damage they are doing to the cause of all-European cooperation with their irresponsible campaign.

It would be nice if all those who are directly or indirectly involved in this campaign would think seriously about this!

Riga Fishermen Interviewed on State of Fleet

LD0409084189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent V. Beketov from Riga]

[Text] If Moscow is called a port of five seas, Riga could be regarded as a city of four ports. What are these? Here we go: The sea passenger port, the sea merchant port, the sea fishing port and the river port. Seafaring and fishing for a long time have been among the Letts' principal vocations. Let's just recall Vilis Latsis' novel "The Fisherman's Son." [video shows street scenes; harbors; moored and plying boats of various sizes; a floating dock]

But there is also the following data. The republic's fishing collective farms are made up in 80 percent of indigenous inhabitants and in 20 percent of settlers. While in Latrybprom [fishing enterprise] its exactly the opposite—80 percent settlers and 20 percent indigenous people. If we consider the significant predominance of the state sector, the balance of power is not in the Letts' favor. Why are things like that? Our interview takes place in the fishing port, right on a ship's deck:

[Begin video interview] [O. Udris, Latrybprom Deputy Director General identified by screen caption] Our fishing fleet has very much become obsolete and as far as mechanization is concerned, it has fallen so far behind that in practice we mostly use the knife and the watch below in our work, and there's the results. Especially as I have seen—Literally several days ago, I returned from a fishing area and that is something that the crews, the sailors are simply indignant about it. Until we change that—we have a great many proposals, we have proposals from foreign companies for working together. They are quite ready to equip our fleet, we are supposed to pay them back in product and its a very realistic discussion. Unfortunately there are a great many obstacles to this now.

[Unidentified man to the left of Udris] We know [word indistinct] the wage norms have to be set by the end result. How is that going to be expressed? In terms of profits or product sales, but under no circumstances by the gross output which today still prevails, or all in all remains the principal indicator.

[Beketov] Comrade Master, do you have many representatives of the indigenous population in your crew?

[K.V. Gayligi, master identified by screen caption] Regretfully very few. In my organization, the transport fleet, I am the only master of local nationality. And on our ship, a new ship, we have been working 2 years, out of a 54-man crew there are only 3 of us here from the indigenous—formerly seafaring—nationality, that's me as the master of the ship, the second mate, Arnold (parshin), and the cook, (krumizh); that's all there is.

[Beketov] We often hear, equally in Latvia and in the other Baltic republics, complaints that, well, the proportion of settlers—they are even called migrants—is too great and growing. But how are these people not to come if there is demand for them, if many vocations, here in the fishing and in engineering, in the textile and light industries, are being filled with people who come from outside? What is the solution to this problem?

[Udris] Well, I think, don't you think that we are artificially creating unemployment through our equipment and our attitude to production, and our attitude to mechanization, to all issues [sentence as heard]. And it's the same with fish. Why do the same foreign ships, having crews a third of the size of ours, have higher productivity and higher output? [Words indistinct] ...and until we solve this, we are not going to have it.

[Beketov] How do you, working with such an international crew, especially as you are a representative of the indigenous nationality—all the others are settlers—how do you manage to organize the kind of collaboration which we would like to see not just on the scale of a ship, but on the scale of the whole country?

[Gayligi] I think that these, that all this new policy is going to promote just that. And the things we've been saying...

[Beketov, interrupting] Do you mean the policy of perestroyka?

[Gayligi] The policy of perestroyka, the policy of our party, the policy of the state. And the things we've been saying about personnel policy, it was precisely the stagnant, somnolent, stalinist time that has precisely reflected as a bad disease on the seamen and fishermen personnel of local nataionality. So now these dams have been removed but we have to resurrect the contact between the generations, to put it briefly.

I am a bilingual man and was raised in two cultures, so to speak, and I have both the Latvian culture and language to the same extent and the Russian culture and language. But I would say that this is very important and this voice from the republics, regarding education in the mother tongue, has to be heard with great attention. [video shows interviews aboard a ship; ships in harbor] [end interview]

Faults In Current Socialism Examined

LD0109125289 Vilnius LITERATURA IR MENAS in Lithuanian No 20, 13 May 89 pp 2, 3

[Article by Romanas Pleckaitis, entitled "To Live and Contemplate."]

[EXCERPTS] We are mortals and live on earth. We build while we are alive. However, we do not exist to build; we build in order to be able to live there. Are all our edifices fit to live in? We agree, the system we live under, currently, is not socialism. In the past, inhumanity was motivated by various means: tyranny, absolutism, dictatorial regimes, fascism, Stalinism and other manifestations. These are all characterized by crimes against the individual, as well as, against nations and mankind. That which had been referred to as socialism, was, most often, only another inhuman motivation.

Who is to blame for the deficiency of the building,—the materials, the builders, or the plan? They are all responsible, most probably. Here, I am going to halt near the plan and its practical fulfilment.

It was proclaimed, the building was—socialism—constructed according to Marxist ideas. What followed, however, was something the Marxists did not at all desire,—their ideas were canonized. It was required to learn them and to follow them. One who is only able to repeat another's thoughts, however, is like an artist's brush, used for painting. New horizons are closed to him. During the entire course of Soviet philosophy's existence, not a single author has come forward, who could be likened somewhat, to the famous philosophers of the 20th century. Since, this should not be a following, but a heritage, not an imitation, but a continuation of ideas: "to obtain from the same fountains, which were used by the initiator, and to learn from one's precursors only the manner, in which it must be done" (I. Kant).

Science is, by nature pluralistic, composed of schools and trends. It is not possible for a single scientific trend to expect to find and solve all the problems of that science. It simply does not have such means, at its disposal, and can only accomplish, as much as, is allowed by its principles. Other trends exist, using other means and therefore discovering and solving problems, the first trend was incapable of finding a solution for. Attempts to treat a single trend and its ideas, as exclusively correct, results in harm, that is very difficult to reverse. The Soviet Union is undergoing this bitter experience.

There exist no universal philosophies,—capable of discovering all the problems of human and universal existence, and solving them. Marxism is a limited philosophy, also, that can only accomplish, what is allowed by its postulates. The most difficult segment of scientific work, is comprised of the discovery of the problem and creation of a hypothesis, that would bear itself out. Many of the current philosophical problems were discovered by other philosophical trends and Marxism did not discover them, since it did not have the means to do so. Marxism is an open philosophy, that assumes progressive ideas of other trends. This is especially true in the areas of logic, gnosiology and scientific methodology. We value Marxist philosophy for its capacity to generate ideas and for its principle and concept influence on social existence.

Creators of Marxism wished to be considered scientists, i.e., that their convictions be opened for criticism. When stated truth is placed outside the boundaries of criticism, it becomes dogma. In the absence of criticism, dogma loses its vitality and becomes formalism. If someone wishes to criticize Newton's mechanics, no one will stand in the way,—go ahead, if you are able to, science is only to gain from it. If the accepted view is correct, but no one is allowed to argue it and to seriously polemicize against it, it begins to lose its soundness and to acquire totally new—superstition characteristics. In the course of becoming absolutized and exaggerated, this truth becomes an untruth.

Along with the acknowledged view, there should exist opposing views, that should be heeded attentively, since the interests of truth themselves demand a divergence of opinion. However, it was considered undesirable, by creators of Marxism, to search for inconsistencies. Thus, they were changed from scientists to prophets.

While viewing creators of Marxism as scientists, I must ask: which of their views fitted the 19th Century and are not suitable for the 21st Century? Where did they go wrong? It would be strange, if they did not commit errors,—they would then, either be demigods, or we would be fools, unable to discern fallacies. It follows, they were not demigods amd we are not fools. Fallacy is an inseparable escort of knowledge. Only those who lack understanding may be shocked by fallacies, but the scientists, themselves, realize these are unavoidable in work. Keeping in mind the dialectical approach to cognition, as approaching more exact truths, progress of cognition is represented not by progressing, from one truth to another, but rather, as a progression to a less erroneus world awareness. [Passage omitted]

The view of religion as—the opium of the people has not been borne out:; (this view continues to be espoused by the most zealous exponents of atheism). The humanist meaning of religion is clarified, once we become aware of its role in modern society, where it protects values common to all mankind. [Passage omitted]

Assertions are made, class struggle is the moving force behind society and the history of society is synonymous with the history of class struggle. Yes, the phenomenon of class struggle is indisputable, however, social experience teaches us, there exist, not only the class history, but also that of the nations' struggle for its existence and for fruition of its yearnings. This is proven, also, by the path the Lithuanian nation has traversed. When its national existence was threatened, during the wars of the cross, it united and founded a state, as a means of defense; the people and their leaders, the dukes, joined under the banner of Vytis, against the Knights of the Cross. This is why the Lithuanian cause prevailed and came out victorious. It was also victorious in 1919-1920, during its struggle for independence. Social development, viewed through the classic viewpoint, solely, appears biased and can be solidly contradicted. Reliance on the assertion, the national question was, first of all, a class question, has resulted in national nihilism and the destruction of national language, traditions and people. This thesis was convenient to those who spread and perpetrated assimilation in Lithuania. They even found an argument to support this. In his writings, "Critical Comment on The Question Of Nationalities," Lenin has set forth the thesis concerning future national merging. Such a thesis could never have been popular in Western Europe; it is especially unappealing, as we see, an immense upsurge of nationalism in the world today. Lenin, apparently also sensed its lack of appeal, since he did not develop it any further and did not create a concept for national merging. Assimilation theoreticians, got hold of this single statement and it used to crop up even in party documents. Apparently, it has been decided, only recently, not to mention it any further.

Publishers of Lenin's Works into Lithuanian, chose an interesting course of action, here. In the first printing, the assertion, that the proletariat supports "vse vedushcheye k sliyaniyu natsiy," [rendered in Cyrillic] is translated" "all that leads to the merging of nations," ("Works," vol. 20, V., 1953, p 19). The publishers changed their orientation, after the merger view lost its popularity—the second publication of the writings is already translated as, the proletariat supports "all that, which encourages nations to unite.." ("Works," vol 24, V., 1983, p 129).

Russian-Lithuanian dictionaries indicate "sliyaniye" may be translated as "to join together," only in a figurative sense. If the theoreticians were to express their thoughts in a figurative sense, their conclusions would become worthless and would not merit anyone's attention.

Marxism revealed material freedom foundations, proving that a biased and inaccurate freedom awareness results in instances, where the spirit is elevated above matter and spirituality, without any support substance. The first condition for freedom is freedom to live. Poverty and deprivation are not considered desirable in modern society. No matter how noble the idea may seem, of freedom being more important than food, a starving individual will regard the problem of freedom, not only as abstract, but also as pointless. The adage, "man does not live by bread alone," connotes, first of all, that bread is the basic condition for human existence.

[Passage omitted] Under conditions of totalitarianism, and drastic persecution, by the government, of those espousing a different viewpoint, society, in becoming aware of the situation, feels even less free. Freedom is acquired by a society, afforded the chance to act without threatening repressions, and individuals being able to choose any type of work or creative endeavor and political conviction. When repressive and terrorist measures are employed, the ensuing situation does not liberate the people, but rather uncovers even further, the full scope of enslavement.

Assertions are made, society's progress is demonstrated by the level of its production capacity development, which is the criterion for social development. Production strength, however, may be used against society, rather than for its benefit. It is possible to develop production capacity and, at the same time, impoverish the inhabitants, militarize the country and force the basic production capability to serve development of the military potential. If we are to believe the foreign press, the Soviet Union occupies the first place in world armament trade. On the one hand—an abundance of tanks, while on the other—a chronic shortage in wide distribution commodities, food shortage and the constant presence of citizen-tormenting lines. The latter shameful phenomenon only appeared in Lithuania in 1940; initially, our city did not have a word for it—when sending us to the store, mother used to say: "Children, go and stand in 'ocheriy' [Lithuanicized version of Russian "line"]. It is possible to develop production strength, however, by fencing oneself in by barbed wire and shooting at each of one's own citizens, who attempts to get out. [as rendered in source]

Social progress should be characterized by actual criteria, that can be understood by everyone, rather than by some abstract categories. Society's well-being is the first criterion: how society is supplied with high quality goods, whether the standard of living is in keeping with the world standard, which segment of society is impoverished, what chance there is for overcoming poverty, and what the conditions of social services and social education are. In order to find successful solutions to these and other problems, the country's economy must be healthy and oriented toward the satisfaction of citizens' needs, rather than those of militarization.

Second—health criterion: the state of public physical health, life expectancy, gene pool, level of medical service and ecological situation. According to published data, we rank only among the fourth tenth of the world's countries, with respect to life expectancy. Society's health must be separated from its well-being, since well-being may attained, at the expense of health, such as, becoming the wealthy seated on top of a pile of rubbish.

Third—moral criterion: what is the moral health of society, what it's social pathology dimensions are and how many of its citizens have been tried or are incarcerated.

Fourth—human rights criterion: how the basic human rights and freedoms of—conscience, speech and the press, assembly, joining associations and parties, and others, are guaranteed and implemented by the state.

A doctrine, that leaves no room for self-criticism, begins to lose its meaning and its influence on people's activity, becoming weaker. The ideas existing outside the limits of criticism are often twistedly implemented. Marx asserted that the means of production, as well as the product itself, must belong directly to those engaged in manufacturing, but this was turned into a situation whereby, in Soviet society, the state government is inserted between the means of production and the producers; the means of production and its products belong to the ministries and departments, which distribute the product. Central theoreticians and their peripheral deputies worked dilligently to cover up this situation. [Passage omitted]

Ideological policy implementation has also become deformed. The highest party echelons rule without being controlled. This summit and the party and state bureaucracy, which have set up an ordered hierarchy, proclaimed themselves the sole source and distributor of truth and well-being and the only judge, therefore, the only righteous one. Existence of opoposition is undesirable, i.e. true control is undesirable. The greatest danger of our times—poisoning by government, arises, in the absence of control. Both the center and perpetrators of its will, within the provinces, had already been poisoned by it. An absence of actual control, i.e. opposition and openness, gave rise to conditions for criminal offenders to thrive, within the highest government organs.

No provision has been made, within the Lithuanian SSR's Draft Constitution, for the existence, in Lithuania, of other parties, only for social organizations.

The prevention of political pluralism and alternative party functioning, even of those admittedly socialist, is an offence against the inherent social right to organize into associations and parties, defined even at the time of the Great French Revolution, individual and citizens' rights declaration, reaffirmed again, by the United Nations Organization's Universal Human Rights Declaration.

Voices are heard, in the Moscow press, that Soviet society has not matured sufficiently, for political pluralism. Well then, Russians are in a better position to judge whether they are mature enough or not. I do not think this concern exists in Lithuania.

The separation of two nations predominates in the Marxist theory: a nation that oppresses and the nation that is oppressed. In opposing any type of oppression, the Marxist party supports the latter, the nationalism of the oppressed nation, recognizing in it its progressive content, which harmonizes with the defense of nationality and vital national interests. The party has supported Arab Nationalism, as it emerged from imperialist oppression, and it supports other countries' national movements, in those nations' struggle for the right to exist. There exists a paradox, however: the party speaks out against oppression, on the one hand, while, on the other hand, it sanctions it, allowing union departments, whose technologically outdated enterprises, in Lithuania, have poisoned the land, the waters and the air, to oppress us. The departments show no concern for ecological or social consequences, of their actions, in Lithuania. These consequences, however, present a direct threat to our nation's existence. A nearby example can be found—namely, the fate of Latvia and Estonia, where, because of industrialization and mechanical importation of workers from other areas, the Estonians and Latvians are now facing the danger of becoming a minority within their own territory.

Lithuania—is our land and we possess an inherent right to it, since, it has been soaked with our forefathers' blood.

When declarations are heard, emanating from high tribunals, that proclaim the party is assuming responsibility for its errors, they fail to convince. They equate party leadership with the entire party. The decisive erroneus decisions were made at the top, without participation by the party majority in, either their discussion or their adoption. No one consulted the party member-s'opinion, prior to forcing his way into Afghanistan. I am certain, the majority of Lithuania's party members, condemned this adventure by Brezhnev and his cohorts, and are duly demanding its, still living, initiators be called to account for it. Party members are living with feelings of guilt, as members of the party, whose former administration has forced the country into a crisis situation. That administration governed as it pleased and established a convenient for itself, voluntaristic state, but not a law-based state. It governed according to the principle: the leaders are to decide what the needs of the society are. Foreign communist party programs envision something totally different: even after coming to power, they will respect political pluralism, as a vital guarantee of state control and normal protection of the citizens' rights.

The creators of Marxism applied the principle of historicity not only to doctrines created in the past, but also to evaluation of their own views—they were aware, not all of their views would evolve into future reality. They sensed, most probably, the fact these views could be twisted, however, they hardly expected, their implementation could acquire a fundamentally distorted appearance. Marxist views became, in part, undesirable, within the society of a collectivist state. Marx had categorically spoken out against censorship, whereas here, it was allowed to become rampant, until very recently. The Republic leaders are expressing their regret over the absence of a censorship law. Even Marx did not seek this. He labeled censorship as the privilege of one party against another and as an expression of terrorism. Rather than seeking to establish sensorship, he sought to create a press law, a different matter, totally.

The housing shortage is obvious. Much effort is being invested in alleviating it. There exists also, another housing shortage, which ranks before, a sudden population increase on Earth, revolutions, world wars and destruction. In the words of M. Heideger, it is a hunger experienced by people, in search of the meaning of life. Man can not remain homeless and he builds and contemplates in order to be able to inhabit it.

Disruptions, Arrests Reported in Azerbaijan

NC0509120789 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] Here is a report from AZERINFORM:

The irresponsible calls made during the unauthorized and insolent meeting in Baku on 2 September for strikes and the disruption of economic relations with other parts of the country have aggravated the situation. Using the calls made by the organizers of the meeting as an excuse, a number of individuals, seeking to create tension, conducted illegal activities in the streets of Baku on 4 September and disrupted public transportation and the normal operation of establishments and administrations. Those workers who did not comply with [word indistinct] slogans were not allowed to proceed to their places of work in [word indistinct], construction sites, and railway establishments. Many parents, fearing violence, kept their children home from school.

According to information released by the Azerbaijan Internal Affairs Ministry, a number of people have been arrested for disrupting public order. They will receive the appropriate punishment.

A great deal of work is being carried out to unite all steadfast forces to resolve the urgent problems in the republic. The fact that lawless activities obstruct this goal must be kept in mind.

Strikes Spread to Azerbaijan Refineries

AU0509123089 Paris AFP in English 1220 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Baku, Soviet Union, Sept 5 (AFP)—A strike by Azeris to assert their right to administer the disputed Armenian enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh spread to oil refineries in Baku on Tuesday, a spokesman for the local Popular Front told AFP.

Soldiers took up position at noon in the NBNZ refinery, where workers were planning to hold a meeting, strike organisers said. It was the first time in the dispute that troops had been deployed in Baku: 1,500 interior ministry troop reinforcements were sent in last week.

According to organisers of the strike, which is scheduled to last a week, all the city's main factories had stopped work or were only partially operational on Tuesday, including those in the oil sector.

The so-called 22nd Congress refineries joined the stoppage on Tuesday morning, they said.

Azerbaijan's oil only accounts for a fraction of the Soviet Union's refined oil requirements, but still supplies neighbouring Armenia and other regions.

Newspapers in Moscow did not carry a single report on the strike in Azerbaijan on Tuesday. Neither did state television, which sent a team to film a meeting of the Popular Front on Saturday.

It has been rare since "glasnost" (openness) became official policy for the media to observe such a total news blackout.

The only indirect reference to events was a reader's letter published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (SOVIET RUSSIA) from a certain Mrs. Mnatsakova, a Russian married to an Armenian in Baku, who said she felt she was "living on a powderkeg."

"We are being threatened; we had our windows broken because I am a Russian and my husband is Armenian. I can't go to sleep at nights. I am so worried about my children going to school."

Oil Production, Transportation Affected

LD0509183489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1803 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Baku, 5 Sep (Azerinform-TASS)—Productivity was considerably lowered today at the Novo-Bakinskiy oil refinery. The reason was difficulties with removing the ready product which have arisen due to the shortcomings of the work of the republic's transportation, as a result of the strike. It began last Monday at the call of the officially unregistered People's Front of Azerbaijan.

Although the oil refinery workers rebuffed the pickets and are continuing to work, the breadth of the strike is having a tangible effect on the enterprise. Due to the disruptions in the work of the urban transportation there are quite a few problems with the delivery of workers to work.

Lenkoran (Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic)—The Lenkoran brick works is working rythmically, without interruption of the schedule, although attempts to disrupt the work have been undertaken.

On Monday morning, two unknown persons came to the enterprise calling themselves representatives of the People's Front. They began to call for a halt to work and for joining the strikers in a number of regions of the republic.

They were given a straight answer. Thousands of inhabitants of the town are awaiting the factory's produce. To stop work means to hold up the construction of new houses, schools, and hospitals in a number of rayons. There are more than enough social and economic problems in the republic without that.

Konarev Seeks Restriction on Railway Strikes

AU0609105689 Paris AFP in English 1039 GMT 6 Sep 89

[report by Sophie Shihab]

[Text] Baku, Soviet Union, Sept 6 (AFP)—Soviet officials have opened talks with striking Azeri nationalists as more troops were sent into the Azerbaijan Republic, now paralyzed by a general strike to protest Armenian separatist demands.

Deputy Interior Minister General Yuriy Shatalin said another 700 special anti-riot troops were deployed in this petroleum city of two million overnight Monday, to back up the 1,500 Interior Ministry troops sent in last week, Soviet journalists said.

The general was quoted as saying that troops were not sent in to break the strike but to maintain order in Baku, which has remained under army curfew since last November when Azeri nationalists massacred ethnic Armenians in the nearby town of Sumgait.

One contingent took up positions in a building near the central city square where a new nationalist meeting is scheduled for Wednesday evening.

The strike, which began Monday, soon gathered momentum, spreading to the city's oil refineries Tuesday [5 September] and halting 300 freight trains. Railway Minister Nikolay Konarev criticized the strikers on television for causing "serious damage" to the Soviet economy.

Three Azerbaijan Communist Party officials were scheduled to speak at the nationalist meeting Wednesday, according to Leyla Yunossova, one of the 15 leaders of the two-month-old Popular Front spearheading the movement.

She said this was agreed on at the first contact between Front leaders and the party's deputy secretary, Viktor Polyanishko, late Tuesday.

But she said no agreement had been reached on their other demands, including an urgent parliamentary meeting on Azerbaijan's disputed Nagorno-Karabakh enclave, which Armenians want transferred to Armenia, and official recognition of the Front.

The strike, which is to last one week, centers on the Azeris demands that the enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh administered directly by Moscow since January return to—and stay under—Azeri rule.

Ethnic Armenians, who are a majority in the enclave, want it absorbed by neighboring Armenia.

Local papers, which were not distributed Tuesday, reappeared Wednesday with an interview with the party's first secretary, Abdul Rakhman Vezirov, confirming that the strike had paralyzed "firms and transportation, preventing economic ties with many Soviet regions".

He blasted people he called "hotheads" who had urged that such links be cut, and stressed "the necessity to pursue contacts on all levels with Armenia to try to resolve the conflict".

Mr Vezirov also confirmed that talks were under way with the Popular Front, which, though not official, contained "some healthy forces".

The railways minister, Mr Konarev, was expected to travel to Baku on Wednesday after a local rail official, Elbruz Abdulayev, failed to obtain any concessions in talks with the Front Tuesday, Mrs Yunossova said.

In his televised statement, Mr Konarev had appealed for an urgent law or decree restricting strikes from the railways sector.

He said the 300 trains—representing 25,000 freight cars—blocked by the work stoppage were causing serious trouble for deliveries to Iran and north towards Russia.

Though the curfew is still in effect in Baku, its recent enforcement has been fairly relaxed up to now.

Residents have nicknamed the nighttime barricades set up around the city the "three-ruble roadblocks"—since locals easily slip through by passing the guards three rubles (about five dollars).

Russians in Azerbaijan Issue Appeal

NC3108103189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 29 Aug 89

[Text] Appeal by the Russian employees of the mechanized administration of Azerneft Construction Trust to the USSR people's deputies:

We, the representatives of the Russian people, live and work in multinational Baku, where we were born. We have been sincerely concerned about the incidents which have taken place in Azerbaijan. In view of this, we, who make up a group of 500,000 people in the republic's population, cannot remain indifferent toward the suffering and pain endured by those who have arrived in the republic after fleeing from Armenia. It can be said that no Azerbaijani has remained in Armenia. We demand that extremist activities of individual groups be terminated since these worsen interethnic relations in the region. Furthermore, we wish to point out that individual transmissions by the central television and individual materials published by the central press are biased. The explanations given to shed light on the false problem of Nagorno-Karabakh in these transmissions and press materials have not been objective.

A Nagorno-Karabakh problem does not exist and cannot exist. The land of Nagorno-Karabakh has always belonged to the Azerbaijanis. Representatives of other nationalities lived together with the Azerbaijanis on this land right from the beginning. The Armenians wish to force the hospitable and friendly owners of this land to move away from their property and become refugees.

No one living in Azerbaijan believed that the flame of interethnic discord could be kindled in our multinational republic. This disastrous flame cannot be allowed to grow.

We raise our children by inspiring in them love toward the land on which they were born and toward all the (?people who live on this land).

We sincerely call for the termination of the activities of the extremists. No one's blood should be shed. The honorable, friendly, and industrious people of Azerbaijan must live and work in peace. This is their legal right, which must be protected. This is a justified demand of the Azerbaijani people. It is because of this justified cause that we, the Russian residents of the republic, support the fraternal people of Azerbaijan.

With deep respect and hope,

[Signed] (?Potnikova), Mishakova, [name indistinct], Yakovlev, Ezanov, Dekalin, [name indistinct], and others.

The appeal was signed by 35 individuals.

PRAVDA, Azerbaijan Criticized on U.S. Resolution

LD0509192689 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2030 GMT 4 Sep 89

[Text] Dear kinsmen, first of all we apoligize for not broadcasting our "Mailbag" program on Saturday, but at this time today. We did this because of our desire to keep you posted on the results of the meeting in Moscow of the members and candidate members of the Bureaus of the Armenian and Azerbaijan Communist Parties Central Committees, even though the communique published in the press on this meeting did not inspire great hope.

One must regretfully admit that the meeting in question produced nothing new that was comforting. After prolonged discussions, agreement was reached that the two republics should do everything possible to eliminate accumulated problems step by step, to engage in a dialogue at all levels to restore traditional ties in social, political, economic, and cultural life and—this above all—to ensure the security of every single family and every single individual.

Thus, once again, we are back to the old refrain: to restore the ties of friendship and brotherhood. But the question is: Have such ties ever existed? Is it not a fact that over the past 70 years Azerbaijan's scientists and statesmen have offended and insulted us, misappropriated our history and culture, destroyed our architectural monuments and purloined our monumental stone crosses? And now they have blockaded not only the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast but Armenia as well.

We do not wish to dwell once again on the atrocities of Sumgait, Baku, and Kirovabad, on the monstrous jubilation that pervaded Azerbaijan over the earthquake in Armenia, on the destroyed railway cars and the dead and injured. Let us confine ourselves to stating that friendship can be restored only through a correct settlement of the Artsakh problem.

And it is no accident that the attention not only of the Armenian press abroad but the world press also continues to remain focused on the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Much has been said recently, in particular, about a resolution passed by the U.S. Senate in support of restoring Karabakh to Armenia and of the steadily growing democratic movement in Armenia, a resolution that has been sent to the U.S. State Department. This latter step was taken so that U.S. delegates should, without fail, raise the points in the resolution of their future negotiations with Soviet officials and exert efforts to ensure the implementation of these points.

According to press comment, the adoption of the resolution also means that the issue of reforms in the Soviet system is not a unilateral issue but forms the fundamental axis of U.S.-Soviet relations. It is on the basis of such resolutions and supplements that the Soviet authorities will have to realize that reforms are not mere conversation pieces but imperatives to be put into effect. Any leader led by logic must realize that such resolutions are positive steps in improving and indeed strengthening U.S.-Soviet relations. Consequently, to declare that the resolution is a provocation—as PRAVDA has done—is a mistake and reveals how incorrectly the Soviet Union has interpreted the spirit of the resolution in question. This resolution is a fraternal appeal to rectify past mistakes and to ensure justice; it is firmly rooted in the principles of defending human rights and this is the only way it should be taken by those to whom it is really addressed. That is that. Let us leave aside the questions of how noble it is and how evenhanded: but the truth is that PRAVDA has called it provocative and Azerbaijan's press has described it in terms that only it can conjure up. The fact is that the issue is both delicate and potent. What is important for us is that the just demand of Artsakh and the entire Armenian people has won the sympathy and approval of world public opinion. Let, then, time and circumstances be the judge.

Ukrainian Draft Law on Languages Discussed

LD0509133689 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Kiev September 5 TASS—The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine has issued today for public discussion the draft of a new republican legislation on languages.

A TASS correspondent was told by Nikolay Khomenko, secretary of the Presidium of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, that the draft was drawn up by a special team of Ukrainian parliament members, scientists of the national academy of sciences and higher educational establishments, representatives of local government bodies and public organisations, who worked on it for the past six months. They endeavoured to reflect in the draft the interests of all the republic's more than 50-million strong population.

The draft grants state status to the Ukrainian language. This will rectify the current situation when the native language of the bulk of the republic's population is emasculated and more and more rarely used. The number of schools, where tuition is done in Ukrainian, has decreased. Ukrainian can be heard less and less frequently at enterprises, offices, organisations, higher educational establishments, government, party and public bodies. According to the new bill the Ukrainian language will be used in business correspondence and documentation.

At the same time, Nikolay Khomenko noted, it was taken into account when drawing up the draft that the Ukraine is a multinational republic. Residing in it side by side with Ukrainians are 11 million Russians, 600 thousand Jews, 400 thousand Belorussians, 300 thousand Moldavians, 260 thousand Poles, 240 thousand Bulgarians, 170 thousand Hungarians, 100 thousand Romanians, 100 thousand Greeks and 50 thousand Crimean Tatars. They are by no means "aliens" or strangers, he stressed. The Ukraine is their homeland. This is why the draft deals not only with the Ukrainian language. The document recognizes the Russian language as the tongue of inter-ethnic relationship among peoples of the Soviet Union. Taken into account fully also is the desire of different nationalities to develop freely their national languages in the republic, to use them on an equal footing in different spheres of state, political and public life. This is an expression of respect for all the peoples inhabiting the Ukraine, for everybody who lives and works here.

Every child, Nikolay Khomenko stressed, must have the inalienable right to be brought up and receive education in the national language of his people. And this is reflected in the draft law.

Strikes Over Moldavian Language Law Increasing

LD0509195889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Unidentified TASS correspondents' report from Kishinev]

[Text] The texts of the laws and decisions adopted at the past session of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet are being published in the local newspapers; in particular, the law on the functioning of languages on the territory of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic.

In the republic today, there are few people who would not have an attitude of approval toward the idea of reviving the Moldavian language. Even those who are on strike are not against this, but all the same, the reading of the documents published does not provoke identical interpretations, and the many rallies and gatherings were not abating by the end of the session. Strikes are continuing to worsen the difficult economic situation. Ahead lies the transferal of the whole business of the republic's production to the state language. It is planned that this will be implemented in stages over the course of several years. It is true that at some enterprises, establishments, and organizations, the enumeration of which is being determined by the republic's Council of Ministers, the business of production may be conducted in Russian or in another acceptable language. Many people, in conversation with TASS correspondents, noted the great difficulties that will unavoidably arise on the road toward the transferal of the business of production to the Moldavian language.

The concern of a section of the population is also aroused by those clauses of the legislative acts which concern the education and upbringing of children. In accordance with the laws adopted, preschool establishment and general education schools will be created on the monolingual principle. In many people's opinions, this will lead to demarcation according to nationality from an early age.

Hope for an improvement in the situation in the republic is connected with the commission created by the USSR Supreme Soviet, for the on-the-spot study of the sociopolitical situation. However, attempts to place definite psychological pressure on it have become noticeable, even before the commission's arrival. At rallies of the workers of Tiraspol, demands can be heard that the strikes be continued until the commission makes a positive decision. The representatives of other social movements also are unbending in their positions. No sign can be seen yet of any of the leaders of the opposing sides changing their minds or trying to find mutually acceptable solutions.

Committee Resolves To Continue Strike

PM0509122189 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 5 Sep 89 p 1

[report by Special correspondent Ye. Kubichev: "Meeting in Tiraspol"]

[Text] Kishinev—Since early Sunday morning [3 September] strike-hit Tiraspol awaited with anticipation the citywide rally scheduled for 1800 hours.

On that day your correspondent managed to speak here with 20 or so of the most diverse people—workers and party officials, local journalists and scientists, members of the republic strike committee, and housewives out shopping. It was impossible not to be struck by the unanimity with which my interlocutors spoke of their alarm at the rising tide of nationalism in the republic and its extreme manifestations, and at certain aspects of the language laws adopted at the just-concluded session of Moldavia's Supreme Soviet. To put it even more simply—people are fearful. They are fearful of the forcible implantation of the Moldavian language. They are fearful that in time discrimination on the grounds of nationality may emerge. They are fearful that certification for knowledge of Moldavian may become a pretext for reprisals by the bosses against inconvenient individuals. They are fearful that the implementation of the language laws will be taken to the extremes which we have long been so good at.

On the broader plane, without exception all those I spoke with mentioned their anguish at the fact that the voice of the Russian-speaking section of Moldavia's population was unheard at the Supreme Soviet session—despite the enormous efforts of the deputies from Tiraspol, Bender, and other cities. At the fact that the demarcation of people by nationality is already discernible in the republic. At the leadership's impotence before the manifestations of extremism on the part of the People's Front leaders. At the fact that the friendship of the peoples of Moldavia faces a real threat. Therefore they have been on strike for 2 weeks now.

I will not conceal the fact that my attitude to these alarms on the part of the 200,000-strong population of Tiraspol and the other cities which have come out on strike is one of understanding. But the strike had exhausted itself as a means of drawing serious attention to the working people's demands immediately upon publication of the decision on the republic strike committee's request for the dispatch of a USSR Supreme Soviet commission to Moldavia for an on-the-spot study of the sociopolitical situation in the republic. As has become known here, the commission arrives today. Its arrival is awaited impatiently. It is hoped that it will approach the strikers' demands with understanding.

It would have been logical to halt or suspend the strike: assisting the work of the commission means rejecting pressure on it. Unfortunately, this approach has not been adopted by the republic strike committee, whose stance was indeed promulgated at the 60,000-strong Sunday rally which took place here on Constitution Square.

It opened with the playing of the USSR and Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] anthems. The state flags of the Union and the republic flew above the gathering. "WE ARE FOR THE EQUALITY OF ALL PEOPLES!", "OUR STRENGTH LIES IN UNITY!", "NO TO EXTREMISM"—such banners were held aloft by those who had come to the square.

From the very outset the organizers exhorted the rally participants to be disciplined, restrained, and constructive. I believe that they sincerely invested this last word with its original meaning. But the trouble is that a rally is not a place for the composed comparison of positions, it is not a place for negotiation, for sober calculation and dispassionate analysis. A rally—for such is its nature—is an elemental predominance of emotions. A rally is a difficult place for a dissenter. At best he will be heard out in polite silence—as happened during the considered and sensible speech by Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee Second Secretary V. Pshenichnikov. At worst there will be whistling and shouting and loud applause, as during the two speeches by Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman M. Snegur.

Not a word was said at the rally about the great economic harm which the republic and the country as a whole are suffering as a result of the strike. Not a word about the ruptured economic ties, the motionless trainloads of output, or the wages of their class brothers working in related sectors in distant cities. Nobody asked the question: What happens when the money runs out?—the money from the striking enterprises which the workers are currently being paid as though for an enforced absence. At their council with the people the rally organizers did not put the alternate viewpoint on suspending the strike until the USSR Supreme Soviet commission has completed its work, on the inadmissibility of putting pressure on it. In the resolution of the republic strike committee, which became the rally's resolution, the first point says: "To confirm their demands adopted by the labor collectives of the striking cities, and to continue the strike."

Moldavian Strikers Meet Republic Leaders

LD0509115389 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] In Moldavia, a republic in the southwest of the Soviet Union where nearly 200 enterprises are on strike, the strikers' committees have met with the leaders of the republic. The talks concerning the recently passed law on languages, which has caused protests of the Russian-speaking population, have failed to produce any positive result.

The Moldavian language has been proclaimed the state one, and Russian is allowed alongside as a language of interethnic communication. The law was passed with deputies dividing clearly along the national lines.

The strikers' committee has appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet to set up a commission to study the situation in Moldavia. Meanwhile, the committee has ruled to continue the strike till the end of the commission's work.

Supreme Soviet Commission Calls for End to Strikes

LD0509151289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1308 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Kishinev, 5 Sep (TASS)—The tension of the sociopolitical situation in Soviet Moldavia continues unabated. Strikes are continuing in the cities of Tiraspol, Bendery, Beltsy, Rybnitsa, and Komrat. Although most of the indigenous population approves the recently adopted "law on the status of the state language of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic" certain articles in the language laws which have been approved by the republic's parliament have met with the resolute disagreement of the non-Moldavian speaking population. The main demand of the strikers is that these articles be abrogated by a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decision.

"Giving Moldavian state language status has been received not only by Moldavians but also by Ukrainians, Russians, Gagauzes, Bulgarians, and Jews as a real step along the path to reviving the whole of Moldavian culture," Petr Denisenko, cochairman of the republican strike committee told a TASS correspondent. However, in justly reviving one language the role of the Russian language should not have been reduced. It is Russian that is spoken by most people in the striking cities. Unfortunately the laws adopted recently did not take into consideration the demands of the Russian speaking population on parity between the two languages, Moldavian and Russian. After the laws were adopted works and factories in several more cities and villages joined in with the 200 striking enterprises."

A USSR Supreme Soviet commission has arrived in Moldavia at the request of the republican strike committee. In order to create the appropriate conditions for its work it has appealed to all citizens and public independent organizations in the republic not to hold meetings and other mass undertakings. The commission has called on striking labor collectives at enterprises, organizations, and establishments to suspend the strikes and renew their labor activity.

Commission Begins Work in Moldavia

LD0509201389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast: "Vremya" Correspondent I. Petkov report, "The Problems of our Federation"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet commission, which has arrived in the republic in order to study sociopolitical situation, has started its work in Moldavia today.

[Petkov] It is expected that the Kishinev airport will resume flights in several hours. This was the reassurance of the strike committee members during the meeting with the deputies' commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [Video shows airport terminal, aircraft landing, small informal meeting in progress, crowd of men, militiamen on duty] The commission had begun its work by appealing to all citizens of the republic and to the public spontaneous organizations to abstain from meetings. It called on all collectives that are on strike—and there are around 200 of them nowadays—to start work.

At the meetings, people are saying with anxiety that they are worried, not only over the laws on languages that were adopted at the recent session of the republican Supreme Soviet, but also over the calls and actions leading to the demarcation of multinational Moldavia, to which so far neither the government nor public organizations have given the necessary rebuff.

[S.G. Shuvalov, deputy chairman of the commission of the Soviet of nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet—identified by screen caption] We have only just had a meeting with the representatives of the strike committees of Tiraspol, the town and the republic. Comrade Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, also was present. Also present were representatives of the leadership of the Council of Ministers and the city party committee. We, the members of the commission, have arrived at the conclusion that these meetings could have taken place before, then many already would have received answers to the questions that are put to us nowadays, to the questions that nowadays are rousing masses of people.

Auyelbekov Heads Commission on Moldavia

LD0509211989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet commission for the study of the sociopolitical situation in Moldavia has begun its work in Tiraspol. The commission is headed by Auyelbekov, the deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee; Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium; Kalin, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers; and representatives of the public are participating in the commission's meetings with representatives of the Moldavian republic strike committee and the strike committees of enterprises in Kishinev, Tiraspol, Bendery, Komrat, Dubossary, and other towns and localities.

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Reviewed

PM0309183289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Special correspondent A. Pasechnik report: "Test of Prudence: Notes From the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Kishinev—On the 2d day of the session's work, when the stuffy heat in the streets of Kishinev, seemingly generated by the tension in the hall of sessions, had reached its peak, a storm suddenly broke. After peals of thunder and a torrential downpour, it passed just as suddenly. But in the hall of the Moldavian Theater of Opera and Ballet, the storm continued—with a fierce clash of opinions and positions, a torrent of slow handclaps, and outbursts of alternately indignant and approving exclamations, leaving no hope that the session would end within the allotted 2 days. And no hope even, as one of the deputies admitted to me later, that the session would arrive at any reasonable, acceptable decision at all.

To be frank, there were more than enough grounds for such profound pessimism. Chief among them was the fact that the tension in events in Moldavia reached its culmination on the eve of the session. So the denouement was all the more striking. After 4 exhausting days (and nights!) of work, the session adopted a whole package of legislative acts whose significance for the republic simply cannot be overestimated.

The Moldavian language, which went into a decline in the long period of troubles and stagnation, was given firm guarantees and a whole program for its revival. Returning to the Latin script, it becomes the republic's state language, plus a means of linguistic communication between representatives of the nationalities living here. Russian is defined in legislation as the language of interethnic communication in the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. The laws adopted specify measures to promote the wide use and development of other languages used in the republic.

The day after the end of the session it is, of course, difficult to assess either its work or the decisions adopted. As S. Grossu, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, noted in concluding the session, that profound analysis is still to come. But it is necessary even now, hot on the heels, so to speak, of the session, to take a closer look at some of its lessons. It is clear, for instance, that the unprecedented heat of the sociopolitical atmosphere in the republic had an undoubted influence on the course of the discussion of the draft law and its outcome. V. Gedzira, a construction worker from Rybnitsa, L. Tsurkan, first secretary of Tiraspol Moldavian Communist Party City Committee [gorkom], N. Demidenko, Moldavian SSR prosecutor, and many other deputies spoke with keen anxiety about the increasingly frequent manifestations of extremism, nationalism, chauvinism, and the kindling of interethnic discord, mutual hostility, and suspicion. The republic was torn apart by a wave of strikes, rallies, and demonstrations which divided the whole population, collectives, and sometimes even families, putting them on different sides of invisible and thus even more terrible national barricades.

But much has been said about this in recent days in the central press, which is covering events in Moldavia in detail. Now I want to talk about something else: This division continued even in the auditorium at the session, especially during its first days.

"That is, unfortunately, true," I. Morar, deputy chairman of the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, confirmed bitterly. "Before you even listen to a deputy you can 'read' his position from his surname—Moldavian, say, or Russian, which is very worrying, because national deafness and intolerance are poor counselors in anything, and especially in state affairs. After all, this is not a rally—it is an official session!"

It was no accident that my interlocutor mentioned rallies. Rally passions, which have now become a common phenomenon in the republic, were transferred, alas, to the session auditorium. Sometimes the speakers did not bother with arguments, at times they hastily put a label on their opponent and made unsubstantiated accusations or gave unverified information. Nor was there any lack, alas, of mutual insults, which is not at all appropriate for the people's elected representatives. Nor did the deputies avoid the strong-arm pressure tactics that are customary at rallies, and, as M. Snegur, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, noted at the session, this pressure is applied from various directions. Whenever they thought it necessary, members of the Moldavian People's Front assembled efficiently and rapidly outside the theater, chanting ultimatums in unison and waving placards and banners. I admit it was an uncomfortable feeling to walk through this chanting by way of a police corridor! And only on the last day, when P. Tsymay, first secretary of Bendery party gorkom, insistently demanded that either normal conditions be created for the session's work, or else it be moved to another city, was this unusual blockade removed, equally rapidly and efficiently.

Another symptom which cannot but cause concern. At times the impression was created that some speakers are more worried about the forthcoming struggle for deputies' seats on the local soviets, and therefore about their popularity among the voters (the whole session was broadcast on republican television and radio), than about the problems under discussion. To put it more simply, they were playing to the gallery. A new phenomenon for us, though one that is probably inevitable given the democratization of the election system. The other side of the coin

Well, this too is a school of democracy, in which we are all first-graders now. And we are learning. Even here, at this session, literally step by step, however slowly, the deputies moved away from those barricades of national division. Literally before our eyes, the awareness grew that the main imperative of the day, as was stressed in the CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics, is the quest for mutually acceptable solutions, the consensus that we first really started talking about after the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The first significant breakthrough, and, perhaps, the most important, at the session came when S. Grossu proposed a compromise—not to enshrine in law the status of Moldavian alone as the language of interethnic communication, as was envisaged in the draft—and USSR People's Deputy I. Drutse, a well-known Moldavian writer, substantially supported him.

And then deputies representing Russian-speaking cities came to the microphone: Now there is something to think about, something to discuss. Another step, another—toward the understanding that you cannot revive one language by setting up red warning flags around another. That is one side of the matter. The other is that you cannot exchange studied accusations of nationalism, while refusing even to pick up a Russian-Moldavian phrasebook, at least as a start. That it is better to think together about how to revive the culture and language of the people who gave the republic its name. To revive it not with resolutions on paper (of which, as USSR People's Deputy N. Dabizha, the poet, noted at the session, there have been more than 100 over the years), but with a reliable law, a law that works.

Mutual understanding fosters hope and frees people from fear for their future. And that fear has sprung up, why deny it, I myself saw a desperate telegram sent to the session secretariat by a Russian family: "Help us to exchange our apartment and leave Moldavia!"

For 4 long days the republic was glued to the television screens, eagerly seizing from the loudspeakers every word uttered in the session auditorium, despairing when the argument seemed to reach a hopeless impasse, when at the end of the 3d day the deputies from Tiraspol and Bendery all but left the session, dissatisfied with its progress....

Rejoicing when telegrams were read out from collectives that had resumed work, when it heard that strikers from Tiraspol are helping country dwellers to harvest fruit and vegetable, without pay.

In a word, the republic lived and died with the session, which underwent a test for prudence and wisdom.

"I think we have adopted the best possible laws, taking into account, as far as is currently possible, both the realities of the day and the strategic tasks of resolving the language problem in the republic," V. Kudryavtsev, chairman of Tiraspol City Soviet Executive Committee, said, sharing his views with me after the final session. "But I do not think they will be received uniformly in our collectives—the confrontation has gone too far. So now we must resolutely normalize the situation in the republic. In this respect we pin our hopes on the deputies' commission set up by the Supreme Soviet, which is to analyze in depth the causes of the mass strikes in our city and others. I am only afraid that it may simply turn into a search for culprits, as usually happens. Especially since certain republican leaders are still going on about some kind of 'conspiracy of directors,' failing to understand the thoughts and aspirations of hundreds of thousands of working people."

...While you are in this auditorium, forget your nationality, one deputy eagerly implored his colleagues, that is the only way to be objective. Not true! We are not zombies. Do not forget your race, but rise above national affiliation, and from those heights of goodwill and mutual respect, see the pain in another's eyes and comprehend it.

Commentatary Warns of Strikes' Divisive Potential

PM0309132589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Pavel Gutiontov "Publicist's Notes": "Why Are We Striking?"]

[Text] I got a call from Tiraspol: "We have been striking for 3 days now, for political reasons, but still nothing in the paper. What are we supposed to think?!"

Let us leave aside for a moment the peremptory tone of the question. Indeed, how is one supposed to interpret the reality that strikes have become a fact of our life, that the flames of the strike struggle are engulfing entire regions so rapidly? In the end, we, in contrast to "them," pay for every strike out of our own pockets, which, to be frank, are not exactly bulging. For what reason are the plants and mines and airports and seaports coming to a halt?

In July the country was rocked by the miners' strikes: They demonstrated to each and every one of us that there must be no dawdling with economic reform, that neglect of working people's basic rights can no longer go unpunished, and that the era of the submissive working class has gone forever.

Well, perhaps it was worth paying for that "campaign against illiteracy." Those hot summer days also clearly demonstrated the political bankruptcy of many armchair leaders, the inadequacies of the trade unions, and much else. I am convinced that all this will soon be reflected in the results of the party report and election campaign and in the local soviet elections.

They say there are also perfectly tangible, practical results: In one place the director's sauna has been closed, in another place the "soap ration" has been increased, somewhere else scarce food has arrived in stores in mining settlements from an unknown source....

But the strikes also revealed the true leaders, strong and authoritative, and, as the first secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, who spent many hours in talks with strike committees in Karaganda, told me, he saw among these people an already formed cadre reserve, party and soviet cadres.

But there is yet another, in my view, very alarming fact. The July strikes also demonstrated the allure and effectiveness of pressure on the "bosses" from a position of strength. Pressure that is not yet restricted by the law, and sometimes not by common sense and a sense of responsibility either.

It would appear that strikes are becoming arguably the most popular form of communication with the authorities, replacing the official letter. Of course, this too is retribution for the high-handed reluctance to heed public opinion, but whereas in the past it was casually suppressed, it now has the opportunity to display an aggressive naivety and an uncompromising attitude, which, let us face it, dangerous demagogues are exploiting with increasing success.

Recently, in Naberezhnyye Chelny a man was tried for raping and then killing an 18-year-old girl. The crime rocked the city, where the crime situation has deteriorated so sharply of late. As a result the people of the city demand not just a public trial, but a trial in the stadium; and when the Tataria Supreme Court rejected this unlawful demand, they threatened a strike at the Kama Truck Plant.... And the unprecedented trial, attended by several thousand spectators, took place: The murderer was sentenced to death....

How indeed could the court have passed any other sentence in such an atmosphere!

I am not questioning the punishment. It is the "Naberezhnyye Chelny experiment" that I categorically reject, because it throws us right off the path toward building a rule-of-law state. In which there would be no question of pressuring the court, even if the case in question is as clear as day to the most famous labor collective. I would venture to suggest that the stadium trial has no bearing on the fight against crime or on instilling respect for the law, but can only further embitter the society in which we live. It could go on ad infinitum; this should not be forgotten even if ideas about the need for public executions are loudly proclaimed by, among others, people who are able to halt the production process....

We have been through all this before, with columns of working people demanding the ruthless extermination of not yet convicted "enemies of the people." For decades the "masses' revolutionary sense of justice" helped to abolish justice, becoming the solid prop of a brutal and bloody dictatorship directed against the masses themselves.

As has been said, democracy is above all procedural power. Neither in the square nor at a strike committee session can laws be adopted or interpreted. There must be no duplication of elected authority—once we have agreed on its primacy.

One should be able to hear another dire warning amid the noise of the hooters of the striking enterprises—the danger of society's splitting along class lines.

We heard at the Congress that the "professor will not defend the interests of the worker." But, ironically enough, this highly dubious assumption was picked up and developed by the "professors": At any rate, certain social scientists are essentially in charge of the Leningrad United Front of Working People, whose declared goal is a "return to the dictatorship of the proletariat." But it seems to me that the workers themselves, most of whom, I believe, realize that in order to be able to work in parliament a deputy's competence, independent opinions, probity, and civic courage are far more important than social status and origin, are the least distressed of all about the "working class' defeat" at the elections of people's deputies. Witness the previous Supreme Soviet, which was highly class-ridden.

I do not want to be misunderstood: The path from the lathe to the parliamentary platform should be as accessible as that to a university department. Many worker-deputies made a big impact at the congress and we remember these speeches as being among the most significant and striking, displaying genuine state approaches and worldly wisdom. But we must not get sentimental about this. Anyway, that would be an insult and, what is more, prevent us from hearing properly....

Yes, the working class is a real force and society is still not exploiting its mighty potential properly. For too long now workers have mainly appeared in a representative capacity, merely adorning presidiums. But it is now clear that the future of perestroyka will be decided in the plant shop. Neither economic nor political reform will succeed in the country without new people emerging from the ranks of the workers on the crest of the political wave—as indeed from the ranks of the peasants or academics.

But the point is that the worker has no need to take his place in political life at someone's expense. There should always be room for any able person.

Nevertheless, the supporters of the "dictatorship" are anxious to demonstrate that the workers do indeed have special interests, which sharply contradict the interests of the rest of society. And it must be admitted that they are getting somewhere. For example, various committees and detachments are appearing, whose class instinct would replace adherence to constitutional order. I believe that one must clearly and unequivocally oppose all formations that are teetering on the edge of the law (including those that are set up on an ethnic basis). It is naive, to say the least, to assume that this is the way we are going to solve ethnic problems, defeat crime on the streets, curb bloodsucking cooperative workers, curtail the bureaucracy, and put idle academics in their place....

But who is trying to steer each of these formations and in what direction—that is the question....

We have seen it all. Hypocritical extolling of the role of the working class did not make the lives of its members any easier and neither did the thesis of the flourishing and rapprochement of nations disguise the leveling and suppression of all things ethnic. We are now seeing the results. Yet there are still people who want to build class barricades right on top of the interethnic barricades. There are examples of this.

Two mining engineers came to the editorial office—the deputy director of one mine and deputy chief engineer of another. They produced their mandate—protocol No 1 of a meeting of representatives of the technical engineering personnel of three Donbass production associations. Following the strikes, the Donetsk engineers (like, incidentally, their Vorkuta colleagues) had reached the conclusion that they needed to organize to protect their interests. An action group had set about creating an association and hundreds of engineers had signed an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet....

What had happened? What did the engineers want to protect themselves against? "Against the wholesale vilification of the intelligentsia that took place in the squares of miners' settlements during the strikes."

Of course, you do not make a worker respect a foreman or section chief by means of a rally resolution, a ministerial order, or even a Supreme Soviet resolution. Our guests also recognized that if the plan and the provision of materials are out of balance an engineer becomes a fixer, a supplier, a squeezer of resources and quotas. He is also chivvies and cajoles and he is responsible both for ensuring a quorum at the trade union meeting and for outstanding party dues.... He simply does not have the time to do what he is supposed to be doing.

Is the engineer guilty when the miner hollers at him: "You are sitting on my shovel!..." Or do they have a common enemy who has turned the engineer into a chief and the miner into a living extension of this shovel? Together, they must both build a different system of mutual relations, in which they will be equal partners in labor, which will offend neither the genuine engineer, nor the genuine worker....

In the conditions of a presposterous economic mechanism it is not only plans that get out of balance, but social ties too. So the engineers warn the Supreme Soviet: "If the hotheads strike again the strike committees will have to bear full responsibility for the safety of the enterprises and for keeping them in working order from the moment the strike is declared, with all the ensuing consequences. We will not send any technical engineering staffer down the mine, to the control console, or to the ventilation unit. As we see it, there is no other way out of the situation....

Well, it is possible that in this way the engineers will be able to demonstrate to their striking subordinates that they too are useful people to have at the mine. But isn't this dispute a rather costly one for society?...

It is time for strong words about the responsibility of those who by their actions or failure to act, their neglect of ordinary people's needs, and their wounding of human dignity and ethnic pride are willingly or unwillingly provoking strike waves.

An example of this is our correspondent's report from Leningrad, which arrived when this issue was about to go to press. Our paper has already mentioned (IZVESTIYA No 238) the strike declared by the collective of motor transport enterprise ATP-35 in connection with the failure to meet the demand that it should cease to be subordinate to the Leningrad Motor Transport Consumer Society. Anxious representatives of the Leningrad Motor Transport Consumer Society and Leningrad City Soviet Executive Committee went to the enterprises to assure the strikers that the decisions the collective was demanding would be made within 24 hours. That was 25 August. Believing the promises, the collective went back to work that very day. But...they had been tricked again. The transport workers' patience ran out and the strike was resumed on 31 August, but this time it was decided at a meeting to transfer all power at the enterprises to the strike committee, without whose agreement no order from the ATP-35 administration would be valid. We are such experts not at untying knots, but at tying them.

Too often we argue without listening to our opponent. You cannot solve ethnic, social or economic problems from a position of strength. We have accumulated a great deal of strength, but we still do not know how to use it for peaceful purposes and in this sense we have not even embarked on conversion yet.

It is vitally important at the moment that we do not divide society, but consolidate all its healthy forces, committed to the success of perestroyka. The hammers of those strikes hit perestroyka even if the strike organizers believe they are hitting its enemies. These blows are destabilizing society and the center of gravity could shift any way at any moment.

And it is particularly dangerous that the strikers should be hearing shouts of approval from both sides.

Kazakh's Nazarbayev Discusses Nationality Issues

PM3008120789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with N. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, conducted by own special correspondent Pavel Gutiontov under the "Nationalities Question: Policy and Practice" rubric: "Choice of Goal"; date not given]

[Text] Alma-Ata—[Gutiontov] Nursultan Abishevich, this is, if I am not mistaken, the first interview that you have given to the central press in your new capacity as leader of the republic party organization. So, if you have no objection, we will start by introducing you to our readers in somewhat more detail: You are not yet 50, you were born into a peasant family...

[Nazarbayev] I acquired my work speciality in the Ukraine, I worked as a miner at the Karaganda Metallurgical Combine and later became secretary of its party committee. I worked on the city committee, the oblast committee, and the republic's party Central Committee and government.

[Gutiontov] In 1986 you were, I think, the first to speak out against the then party leadership of Kazakhstan.

[Nazarbayev] I do not want to to recall that now.... I will simply say that after the republic party congress, from whose rostrum I spoke bluntly about serious shortcomings in the style and methods prevailing in the leadership of the republic in the period of stagnation, I went through a bad time. But I withstood the many months of pressure, particularly as I already had experience—my undue independence had made me an "awkward subordinate" before.

[Gutiontov] All right, let us hope that your experience demonstrates that such independence is ultimately "profitable": In any event, at the age of 44 you became chairman of the Kazakh Council of Ministers—the youngest leader of a republic government in the country at the time. Your recent speech at the Congress of People's Deputies (I am not trying to flatter you, but I did think it one of the most incisive and profound speeches made from the congress rostrum).... What, incidentally, was the reaction to it here, in Kazakhstan, and in Moscow?

[Nazarbayev] In Kazakhstan the reaction was positive. I received telegrams of approval by the sackload even while the congress was on—and I do not exaggerate, by the sackload. True, I should say that I did not agree the text of the speech with anyone: Working in the government, I was well aware exactly whom it might displease. As for Moscow... The speech naturally did not please the departments.

[Gutiontov] Did they express this in some way?

[Nazarbayev] In the most direct way. I do not want to further exacerbate my relations, so I will refrain from specific examples. But I do consider that the congress through its own decisions and the subsequent first session of the Supreme Soviet did in point of fact support my speech; the people of Kazakhstan supported it completely; but I fully appreciated that it would produce a quite different reaction in the departments. Well, I did not act against my conscience, I stand by every word, the speech contained no fiction. So why then do some people imagine that we party officials and soviet leaders—why should we be inflexible, why should we not react to present-day life rather than adhering to some outmoded dogmas?

[Gutiontov] If you do not object, Nursultan Abishevich, I would like to continue the discussion you started at the congress. There is an important reason for this: The other day the CPSU draft nationalities policy platform was published, a document which it seems will determine the fate and development of our federation. Could you not share with us in this regard your vision of the range of all these problems that have been hushed up for so long but which today demand immediate and principled solutions.

[Nazarbayev] The draft platform does, of course, require in-depth collective discussion and careful study of all its provisions—for which very purpose it has been published and will be submitted to a Central Committee plenum. But I am ready to give my opinion right now: The draft contains qualitatively new, bold, and at the same time well-conceived ideas designed both to eliminate today's contradictions to the utmost possible degree and to implement our multinational Soviet society's long-term programs. It is indeed a platform on which we can base ourselves.

You will appreciate that we have long regarded the problem of interethnic relations in our country as a purely ideological one. That enabled us to ignore how strongly it is bound up with the economy and politics.... Particularly, it seems to me, with the economy. The ideas of republic economic accountability and the switch to self-financing which are now making headway are, I am certain, making a large contribution to stabilizing interethnic relations.

[Gutiontov] Kazakhstan is developing its own concept of republic economic accountability....

[Nazarbayev] Yes, we have been working on it for 2 years now, and it is distinct in many respects from that which, say, the Balts, are proposing. This is, however, only natural: They have their own specific features and we ours, it is time to stop treating everyone the same.

[Gutiontov] It is thought by some that the switch to economic accountability in today's situation could have an adverse impact on the largest republics—the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Kazakhstan....

[Nazarbayev] First, I do not understand why economic accountability should necessarily "hit" anyone. But if it does, I still do not know whom it will strike. Perhaps those who consume raw materials if we set objective prices.

Kazakhstan's economy has taken shape almost exclusively as the country's raw materials base. I can tell you that we produce 40 percent of the country's zinc, around 60 percent of its lead, 90 percent of its yellow phosphorus, 95 percent of its chromium ore, one-third of its copper.... Gold, silver, petroleum... If you calculate all that in world prices (we are carrying out such work now), it turns out that the republic simply can't fail to prosper.

Yet we rely on subsidies—because the system of wholesale prices is distorted and because we are forced to bring in from outside 44 percent of our consumer goods.

This is all the direct result of the administrative diktat of departments, which has to be abandoned. It is not just a matter of prices for raw materials and goods. If you look, virtually all the enterprises in the republic come under the jurisdiction of union ministries, yet they allocate us less than 1 percent of profits and nothing at all of the hard currency generated in Kazakhstan. However, we consider that a minimum two-thirds of profit should remain here.

I don't believe we need to take over all of these enterprises, "to decouple ourselves from Moscow" (these sectors are too important for the country as a whole, and we are not ready for this yet), but relations with the center must—and quickly—be radically restructured.

[Gutiontov] Regarding this question, the draft platform sets the task of clearly delineating the competence of the republic and the Union. Where, in your view, does the demarcation line run? Incidentally, discussion of this topic has already flared up at the Congress of People's Deputies and the First Session of the Supreme Soviet.

[Nazarbayev] I will start again with economic questions. Mineral resources, land, and water should be the sole property of the republic—that is mandatory, everything stems from it. Union departments with enterprises on the republic's territory or intending to construct them there should do so only with the local soviet's authorization or on the basis of a contract with it. As regards policy, I consider it essential to retain the central legislative power's supremacy.

[Gutiontov] To what extent?

[Nazarbayev] That should be agreed between the Union and the republic supreme soviet. Every republic can have its own agreements, but I do not think we can allow any dismemberment of our state into national compartments. The laws should be common in principle; republic laws should be adopted on their basis in the light, of course, of their own specific features.

[Gutiontov] A dispute broke out at the Supreme Soviet session as to whether we need common fundamentals of electoral legislation....

[Nazarbayev] I think we do. But it is necessary once again, however, to restrict ourselves to elaboration of the fundamentals and principles. While everything else resides within the complete competence of the republic. For example, we very much question whether it is necessary to convene our own congress. Why will some deputies be engaged full-time in the legislative process, while others are not? Is it not better for the Supreme Soviet to be elected directly and for the whole Soviet to work? Or, maybe, it is not worth rigidly applying the provision on combining the posts of party committee secretary and soviet chairman? I think a soviet could be headed by another person of authority, including a nonparty person. In short, we published our own draft changes to the republic's Constitution the other day, and it does differ from what other republics are proposing. But I don't think there's anything dreadful in that.

So, I repeat: Economic sovereignty is complete political sovereignty within the bounds clearly outlined by the consitution. We have to fill the word "federation" with genuine meaning and develop republic sovereignty as part of the federation. I think that a union of separate states in our conditions is, if you will forgive me, lacking in seriousness. Yes, the diktat of the center must be abolished. The country should be decentralized to a certain degree, but this degree must be unambiguously defined.

There is, after all, in my view, another dreadful danger here. Suppose our decentralization were merely to degenerate into a "decentralized bureaucracy..."

[Gutiontov] What do you mean?

[Nazarbayev] Well look here, who is now the chief enemy of the lease contract in the countryside? I will tell you: The very directors of the state farms [sovkhoz] who were still until quite recently shouting "Give us independence!" The reason being that a lease-based collective will not sustain out of its own money the army of the sovkhoz apparatus, and, naturally, the latter is putting up desperate resistance. Those who are told they are not needed will inevitably endeavor to prove their necessity and justify their office and telephone.

That is why I say that it is not enough to decentralize power, to transmit it "downward," and rest content. It is important whom we transmit it to "down below." IZVESTIYA has written about the situation in Dzhambul Oblast's Merkenskiy Rayon—the punishment meted out for criticism and the suppression of the bases of democracy. I think that the picture drawn by the newspaper is perfectly objective. But who, then, was responsible for all these antics? The local authorities... (Footnote) (See E. Maksimova and Yu. Orlik "Suspected of Conspiracy" (No 254, 1988) and V. Ardayev "We Have Bribed Your Newspaper!" (No 289, 1988]. Let us acknowledge that we have not only not yet set up a democratic management system and do not even have a clear perception of one. We are now pinning great hopes on the elections, but if the marvelous slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" again degenerates into the power of the executive committees [ispolkom].... The apparatus, I do assure you, will be endeavoring...

[Gutiontov] Nursultan Abishevich, let us not act contrary to our conscience, the ispolkoms have no real power now.

[Nazarbayev] I understand you. Yes, the party in our country has shouldered everything—every aspect of life, the economy, politics, culture.... That is why it is now answerable for everything. But is is not enough here to say that the party is the initiator of perestroyka, heads it, leads. That is, of course, the case. But let us acknowledge that it is led and directed by the Central Committee in Moscow, and many of those who once really took up perestroyka are gradually beginning to lag behind and sometimes retire to the sidelines. To be the vanguard you have to be in the vanguard, but today some of our workers are basically incapable of finding themselves work: They are used to their job being to issue an order to the chairman about how much manure to cart out to the fields. I consider, however, that our prime party task today is to side with the masses, who have appreciated all the advantages of working in the new way. Party leadership consists in removing the obstacles to reform and supporting the processes of democratization and glasnost.

For the time being, however, some party organs appear against this backdrop of the broad politicization of the people as virtual "strongholds" of dogmatic thinking. We are only just beginning the struggle for changes here. Literally the other day Alma-Ata Party Gorkom elected a new secretary in a contested election. The new chairman of Taldy-Kurgan Oblast Ispolkom was elected in just the same way a bit earlier.

People today are fed up with those who direct them, including their way of thinking. When they sense that party workers are still locking themselves up in their offices, won't engage in frank discussion with the people, and automatically categorize everyone who thinks differently as "extremists," there can be no question at all of trust here. In other words, the main and indispensable condition for restructuring party organs' work is to finally go out to people and in vital contact with them demonstrate that the party's main task is to satisfy to the maximum degree the needs and requirements of working people and defend their fundamental interests.

[Gutiontov] The draft platform provides for a kind of balanced representation of the various nationalities in all organs of management. To be honest, it is not quite clear to me how this can be effected, whether or not the idea will take the form of another marathon bout of sifting through paperwork. On the other hand, disregarding this principle is also dangerous.

[Nazarbayev] I think that everyone should be offended by the awareness that a post is being given him purely because he belongs to a particular nation, as if he were an invalid being offered a seat in a streetcar. I am convinced that the sole anmd most important criterion is a person's degree of preparedness—his skill and his political and human qualities. But that there is distortion here is obvious. You only have to look: A mononational leadership has in point of fact been formed in the center, Moscow. How many ministers in the government are representatives of national republics? Have you ever seen a Kazakh, Uzbek, Kirghiz, or Tajik Central Committee department chief, or in the leadership of the Ministry of Defense, the KGB, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR?

Look at what happens. We are reproached for the fact that only 0.21 percent of Soviet Army officers are Kazakhs. At the same time even Alma-Ata's military colleges are permitted to enrol no more than one-tenth of young people of local nationality. How is one supposed to understand and assess this?

Or another example: I have been trying to get a Kazakh into the cosmonaut squad for over 2 years now—we send foreigners into space, after all. Baykonur is in Kazakstan! Do you know, I was unable to find a single suitable Kazakh fighter pilot. Eventually a civil pilot—a record-holder and a fine guy—was found, thank god; and he is now being trained.... Well. This is all difficult, it becomes bottled up in people. When glasnost and democratization did come along, we should not have been surprised that everything that had been built up should burst out, sometimes assuming not the best or even unrestrained forms. Some people even blame perestroyka for this. But it is nothing of the kind, everything was building up but people simply stayed silent and kept everything inside. If we do not fully and soberly take this on board, we will be like someone who steps on his own foot and shouts with pain but does not have the good sense to take his foot away.

[Gutiontov] You said a very important thing about the mononationalization of power. It seems to me that it is in many respects because of this that there appear here and there anti-Russian slogans—when in actual fact is not at all the Russians as such who are the target, nor "Russophobia"—it is largely a reaction to the actions of the center, of authorities associated by people with the rule of—as we used to say not long ago—"big brother."

[Nazarbayev] You know, anyone of my generation will remember the following: If two Kazakhs in a village get carried away by argument, you need to call a Russian friend and let him arbitrate. I witnessed it myself. That is how we lived and grew up. The development of the virgin lands, the creation of industry in the republic, and the associated influx of people from other parts of the country—none of these things by themselves spoiled relations among people. The purity of those relations was spoiled by the foolish policy of mistrusting local cadres. An example: I am the 14th Central Committee first secretary, but only the third Kazakh. How many leaders at a lower level have been sent us from Moscow. They know neither local conditions nor their specific features, but they come and run things. I am reminded in this context of the fact that when Governor General Kolpakovskiy was sent to Semirechye in the last century that he was prepared in advance. It was considered essential that he study the canons of Islam and know the language, customs, and so forth. Incidentally, it was he who opened the first Kazakh-language school, in the then city of Vernom.

[Gutiontov] Last year one representative of the center came to the Transcaucusus and spoke to a party aktiv about the conflict surrounding Karabakh: "I do not understand how two fraternal Muslim peoples can fail to share."

[Nazarbayev] He said that. However, I am not surprised. But shouldn't someone consider all these problems? Look at what we study in school about the history of the USSR. We continue to study the history of the Russian State. There are institutes in Moscow working on the problems of non-Soviet Asia, Africa, the United States, and Canada, but is there an institute in Moscow studying the problems of our peoples?

The present generation of Kazakhs has only just learned the names of such major representatives of its own culture as Shakarim Khudayberdiyev, Magzhan Zhumabayev, Zhusupbek Aymautov, and Akhmed Baytursunov, who were shot during the years of Stalinist repression and have only now been rehabilitated. But in the fifties and later, the label of nationalist was pinned with uncommon ease on many of those who are the real pride and joy of the nation. The great Mukhtar Auzzov was forced to leave Kazakhstan; Kanysh Satpayev, a scientist of world repute to whom we owe the discovery of major mineral deposits, had to quit his post as president of the academy; and other writers and representatives of the intelligentsia were persecuted solely because they tried to come into contact with their own culture and history. The bitterest pill to swallow is that all this was done under the banner of internationalism and often by our local "champions" of internationalism.

[Gutiontov] Internationalism has long been understood in our country as the suppression of what is national, whereas it should rather support it.

[Nazarbayev] I agree. But did we not live under the slogan of the "merging of the nations" and even succeed in implementing it, many thought? It was Brezhnev, I think, who said that the friendship of the people is a diamond whose every facet sparkles. A fine phrase, but in practice the commands sent here from the center implied not so much "diamond cutting" as a mold.

With this "ideological backup" the all-powerful departments ruined the steppe around Ekibastuz, destroyed the Aral Sea, and filled the sky over Dzhezkazgan with smoke. Nothing was our own, it all belonged to someone else! Give us metal, give us coal! The fact that these people are situated in Moscow does indeed, you are right, make people associate them with Russia and the Russian people, although, if you examine things objectively, it is the Russian people who have suffered most from such departmental policy and Russia, which is the richest in all resources, which has ended up in the worst position.

[Gutiontov] I read in an Estonian magazine that "Moscow and Tallin are suffocating from the same smog."

[Nazarbayev] That is undoubtedly so. It is very important that we all appreciate that the destruction of the administrative-edict system is a crucial period when it is essential to concert our efforts and direct them toward solving the most acute socioeconomic problems rather than rushing around in search of culprits among our neighbors.

[Gutiontov] The Kazakhs have more neighbors perhaps than anyone else. There is a reason that during the years of grandiloquent phrases the republic was called the "laboratory of internationalism," "the land of 100 languages."

[Nazarbayev] Yes, there are dozens of nationalities in the republic, but it should be bluntly said that Russian is now the language used in practice. All state affairs, all political questions, and all our measures are carried out exclusively in Russian. I was at a rayon party conference—with 298 delegates, all Kazakhs, and one rayon military commissar, who was a Russian—and yet it was conducted in Russian.

We consider that special concern should be shown toward the Kazakh language today. Our writers and poets are rightly worried that there will soon be no one to read them in their native language. The broad public, including the Russian public, see the radical measure of legislatively enshrining for Kazakh the status of state language as affording real protection for the indigenous nation's language.

[Gutiontov] But Kazakhstan, after all, is more than just a bilingual republic, it is multilingual, with Kazakhs forming only around 40 percent of its population.

[Nazarbayev] The main population groups in our republic now are Kazakhs, Russians, Germans (around 1 million), Koreans, and Uygurs. Newspapers are published in those languages, they are used for radio and television broadcasting, there are Korean, Uygur, and German theaters in addition to Russian and Kazakh ones. There are national schools. Only I do not want this to be taken as one of those optimistic reports in the spirit of the old days: There is a host of problems and they will all have to be resolved come what may.

We have published the Kazakh SSR draft law on languages, which a large group of scientists, specialists, and cultural figures in the republic worked on for a long time. I am not going to give an exhaustive assessment of this document—that is a matter for all Kazakhs, to whose judgment it has been submitted. I shall only note that the legal concept of the draft differs considerably from the concepts of similar laws adopted in other republics in that its internationalist essence is emphasized. The main criterion which guided the authors of the new law was the realization that the true well-being of the people who gave their name to the republic cannot be achieved by infringing upon the rights and freedoms of people of other nationalities.

I repeat that if your sense of national identity is satisfied at your neighbor's expense, I would not presume to call that patriotism. People are easily pleased nowadays by "radical" and forthright speeches, but the last thing that genuine concern for your people's interests needs is scathing phrases and appeals. We have very much explanatory work to do in this respect, and I can tell you that this will take a vast amount of my time.

[Gutiontov] In that regard allow me to ask for your attitude toward the so-called informal organizations, conventional though that name is.

[Nazarbayev] I don't like it either, but it is clearly not a question of terminology. Experience has shown that many proposals put forward from the grass roots are quite capable of being implemented immediately and to good effect. Yet we began by giving them a hostile reception, we avoided the informal association people like the plague. Even now our mutual relations are far from perfect.

Of course, the road to mutual understanding is not at all easy. But to make it as short as possible it is necessary to learn how to appreciate active people and not see them merely as troublemakers. I am sure that many of them could immediately be appointed to party and soviet work because they are already real leaders as it is. So we should rely on them and make them a cadre reserve.

[Gutiontov] But do many of them not align on national grounds?

[Nazarbayev] I don't think so, not many of them. Some people, of course, are trying to emphasize that aspect. it cannot be denied, but on the whole all the movements are internationalist in spirit, aims, and composition.

Yes, there are people here who are too quick to forget the threat posed by national strife, even though regrettably there are more than enough tragic examples of that in other parts of the country today, too. I believe that on no account should we tolerate actions capable of sowing the seeds of distrust and suspicion among representatives of the different nationalities.

The time itself demands from us not assurances of our commitment to the ideas of perestroyka but concrete actions to implement those ideas. People must really feel that the party is aware of the urgent problems and is not hiding from the difficulties but is confidently and boldly setting about resolving them.

Uzbek Deputy Writes on Interethnic Issues

PM3108090989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by USSR People's Deputy E. Yusupov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "When the Stereotypes Are Abandoned. The Nationalities Question: Policy and Practice"]

[Text] As we gradually emerge from the hypnosis of the "indestructible friendship of the peoples," we are beginning to think about the meaning of such values as social justice in interethnic relations, national interests, and the equality and equal rights of the peoples in all spheres of life. The stereotypes have at last been abandoned. The reality of life itself has prompted us to seek real, rather than artificial means of strengthening the unity of the multinational Soviet Union.

Let us deal in specifics. So much has been written about the successes of Uzbekistan and other Central Asian republics during the years of Soviet power! To deny them is unworthy. But it is no less unworthy to deny the major deformations in the economy and the cultural sphere either. Both the center and overcautious people locally are to blame here. For example, it is mainly the mining and processing industries which have developed in Uzbekistan. Almost 9 percent of the country's chemical industry enterprises are concentrated here. This, of course, has not been conducive to environmental cleanliness. On the contrary, despite large labor resources and colossal sources of raw materials we have extremely few modern industrial sectors—electronics and machine building. As for the canning industry, its annual output is... 1.5 cans per person. With the fruit and vegetables we have!

Uzbekistan's place in the integrated national economic complex, it has turned out, conforms neither to its potential nor what our entire Union expects from it. Enough has been said already about the cotton monoculture. In many rayons it is planted right up to the doors of people's homes. The soil has been depleted by the absence of crop rotation. There is no denying that the country has a great need of cotton. But there are progressive solutions which enable the interests of the country and the republic to be balanced.

In this context I shall touch on a question that is crucial to interethnic relations—that of how to assess each republic's contribution to the country's economic development. Articles are appearing in the press now which speak about subsidies to individual republics from the all-union budget and about the alleged intensification of parasitism in those places. A particular republic cannot feed itself, they say, and it lives at the expense of others. With regard to my republic, for example, people who work in the fields from dawn till dusk and who earn wages 2 to 2.5 times below the subsistence minimum are willy-nilly accused almost of scrounging.

The parameters for determining national income are hopelessly out of date. Republics which produce agricultural raw materials are in an extremely unfavorable situation now. Since one of the main items in the formation of national income is turnover tax, which is formed on the basis of the production of finished output, the Central Asian republics, which produce cotton, silk cocoons, and kenaf, are always at a disadvantage: These crops are turned into finished output in other parts of the country and payment for it goes into the budgets there. It is unbelievable: The Uzbek budget receives meager scraps from cotton growing—the republic's main agricultural sector. The republic's textile industry uses about 8 percent of the fiber produced in Uzbekistan. Mineral extraction is not taken into account, nor is the output of all-union ministry enterprises (though these constitute one-third of all the republic's industrial enterprises).

Undoubtedly we should all think about increasing each republic's contribution to perestroyka and about the rational use of their natural and human resources. But it is for that very reason that there must be objective information which does not impugn people's honor or dignity and does not belittle anyone's role in the country's socioeconomic development.

There must be greater social justice in the price formation sphere, too. It is well known that the prices for raw materials are set by the central directive organs. Why then, have cotton prices remained at a very low level for several decades while equipment, fertilizers, and all types of services have become more expensive? Cotton has thus become a loss-making crop. It is no wonder that such contradictions are perceived as an infringement of people's rights. If we remove the economic contradictions, among other things by raising purchase prices for raw cotton, we will also remove interethnic contradictions.

Now for a few thoughts on social justice in the sphere of national interests. Let us recall V.I. Lenin: "The only correct attitude to the nations' interests...will be to satisfy them as much as possible and create the conditions which preclude any possibility of conflict on that ground" (Complete Collected Works, Vol 45, p 240).

This wise precept has gradually been forgotten, both in theory and in practice. Yet national interests are a profound social and psychological phenomenon affecting all aspects of a nation's life. They will exist as long as nations exist. To study them and satisfy them as much as possible is the most urgent of all tasks in view of the fact that all our republics are now multinational: More than 50 million people in our country live outside their national state formations. There are also peoples small in number which have no national state structure.

Crimean Tatars and Meskhetian Turks have been living in Uzbekistan for over 45 years now. The proximity of their language, religions, national character, and culture has brought them together with the indigenous peoples here and intensified their family kinship ties. They have made a considerable contribution to the development of the republic's economy and culture. As chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet standing commission on interethnic relations, I have received representatives of those two peoples on numerous occasions. While emphasizing their gratitude to Uzbekistan they have also asked for help in returning to Georgia and the Crimea from where they were forcibly deported as a result of Stalin's tyranny. I well understood their feelings and their homesickness. That is a feature of the human soul. The Uzbeks have a saying: "Better to be a pauper in your own land than a king in a foreign land."

What happened in Fergana recently does not reflect the relations that have been established between Meskhetians and Uzbeks over the decades. It is a bitter lesson and a shameful page in the history of ethnic relations in the republic. Especially since it all happened at a time when the problem of the Meskhetian Turks' return to their ancient homeland had been raised. We in Uzbekistan sincerely want the Crimean Tatars and Meskhetian Turks to remain among us. But the recognition of their right to return home would be a display of social justice in satisfying their national interests. Although this question is a complex one, its practical solution needs time and compromise.

Now a few words about language. Quite a lot has been done to develop languages. But there were distortions in the understanding of their significance and viability. Take my native tongue, Uzbek, for example: The sphere of its use in official correspondence, science, and education has gradually contracted. As a consequence, the number of scientists capable of preparing major academic works in their native language has declined. What about in everyday life? Many people of Uzbek nationality were unable to fill in applications or write a telegram in their own language....

None of this was the fault of the party's nationalities policy or the desire of the Russian people. Russians living in the republic were also indignant at the state of the Uzbek language. This was exaggerated by the "ultra-internationalists" and careerists who did the Russian people and their language a disservice. Now it has become necessary to give the Uzbek language the status of the republic's official language. But that does not mean giving privileges or advantages to the language of the indigenous population. Our aim is to restore its legitimate rights, expand the area of its use, and at the same time pay great attention to Russian as the means of interethnic communication as well as to the free development of the languages of all the nations living in Uzbekistan.

In conclusion, I want to talk about the special responsibility of the intelligentsia in periods of interethnic crises. The bitter truth is that it is representatives of the intelligentsia and leading workers who have now become the instigators of many negative phenomena in interethnic relations. It is intolerable when national conceit and national egoism are instilled and history rewritten in the guise of defending national interests. That is how the masses begin to be infected with nationalism and chauvinism, especially young people lacking experience of life. And this is despite the fact that division on national or religious grounds is alien to the majority of our young people. Their main motto is to live and work honestly and have normal human relations with everyone living around them.

I shall return to my starting point: It is only by consistently observing the principles of social justice in interethnic relations that we will be able to really serve perestroyka and the democratization of social life. We are directed toward that by the CPSU draft platform on problems of nationalities policy.

Prosecutor Seeks Jail Term for Former Uzbek Leader

LD0509174989 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 5 TASS—The oral statements of the parties finished at the trial of Uzbekistan's former prime minister Normankhanmadi Khudayberdiyev held at the USSR Supreme Court.

Public Prosecutor Viktor Levitskiy described the trial as that of bribes and corruption. He said the testimony of Khudayberdiyev and witnesses, given by them during the preliminary investigation, should be considered authentic.

It should be reminded that during the court proceedings all witnesses retracted their testimonies given at the preliminary investigation in which they accused Khudayberdiyev of taking bribes. Former Soviet first deputy interior minister, Yuriy Churbanov, also denied taking 50,000 roubles in bribes from Khudayberdiyev. Churbanov was found guilty on this charge by the military board of the USSR Supreme Court in December 1988.

Levitskiy said that witnesses' testimonies contain many significant discrepancies with regard to how, where, when and who of the investigators specifically threatened them. Despite Churbanov's denial of taking a bribe from Khudayberdiyev, the fact of bribetaking should be considered as proven, the public prosecutor noted, because Churbanov had admitted it at his trial. Taking into account the social danger, Levitskiy asked the court to find Khudayberdiyev guilty of taking 22,000 roubles in bribes and giving a 50,000-rouble bribe and sentence him to 12 years of imprisonment at a correction labour colony of enhanced regime, with the confiscation of property.

Khudayberdiyev's lawyer Genriy Reznik asked the court to acquit Khudayberdiyev on all counts of the indictment. He took note of what he called "gross violations of the code of criminal procedure on instituting proceedings, arresting and ensuring the right for defence." Reznik questioned the testimonies given by the defendant and said they were written under pressure from the bodies of preliminary investigation. He also stressed that his defendant was in such a state of health that "it was easy to force him to give the necessary confession." The lawyer also pointed to many contradictions in the case.

On this the oral statements of the sides were completed. Under the law the defendant will be given the right to make his final statement, after which the court will pass its sentence.

Work of AUCCTU Outlined as Plenum Opens

LD0509213189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Excerpt] As we have already reported, a regular plenum, of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] has opened in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions. Our correspondent, Boris Simonov, asked Igor Yevgeniyevich Klochkov, a secretary of the AUCCTU, to comment on the first day of its work:

[Klochkov] The main thing we have to solve at the plenum is for the trade unions, at all levels of their structure, to concentate on matters concerned with protecting the interests of working people. That is the main thing. The trade unions have accumulated many and varied functions over the decades and have, in the process, become removed from the basic one, the protective function. The recent mass strikes in the country's coal-mining regions and in other sectors of the national economy showed that the working class, the working people, are not satisfied with the trade unions' stance; they are dissatisfied with how the trade unions are performing their protective functions. It is no coincidence that in a number of places this protest was not expressed through the trade union committees, but through strike committees. Serious lessons have to be learned from all of this.

The second thing we have to elaborate in the course of this plenum is our attitude toward economic problems. We have to elaborate the trade unions' attitude toward and place in solving these problems that have accumulated. Therefore, demands to be levelled at the government, at union level, are being formulated, both in the report, and now, in the course of the discussion that has developed following the report. The trade unions' stance on protecting the consumer also is being formulated. In particular, proposals are being submitted—they are being discussed just now—on freezing the prices of consumer goods, the so-called goods in the consumer basket—in other words, not the whole range, but specifically, the vitally necessary goods you come up against every day and which you cannot live without—in order to prevent a further deterioration in the standard of living. I believe that there is still a whole series of interesting, constructive proposals to be submitted because the plenum is in progress. We still have an evening session to come today, and it is planned to use the whole of tomorrow. [passage omitted]

Role of Trade Unions Viewed

18280277 Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Aug 89 p 1

[Article by A.V. Khrapach, secretary of the Gukovo territorial committee of the coal industry workers trade union, and AUCCTU candidate member, under the rubric "TRUD Questionnaire," Gukovo, Rostov Oblast: "Trade Unions: A Time of Testing"]

[Text] **The next plenary session of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] will be held on 5-6 September. On the plenum's agenda will be a summing up of the discussions of the draft USSR Law on "The Rights of USSR Trade Unions," and urgent tasks of the trade unions in the current stage of perestroyka. The**

editorial staff asked the following questions of some of the participants of the forthcoming AUCCTU plenum:

1. What are the main lessons which, in your opinion, should be drawn from today's complex processes in the economic and socio-political life of the country?

2. What must be done first in order that the position and actions of the trade unions correspond with the expectations and demands of the workers?

Secretary of the Gukovo territorial committee of the coal industry workers trade union, and AUCCTU candidate member, A.V. Khrapach

1. The trade unions are literally taking exams now. Alas, by far not all of them will pass. A trade union mine committee was reelected (as well as, incidentally, a soviet worker collective) on the demand of the 60th Anniversary of the Lenin Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] of the "Gukovugol" PO [Gukovo Coal Production Association] Mine, which in June conducted a 10-day strike to achieve economic independence and the resolution of a number of social questions. It turned out to be "on the curb of life," it could not become a genuine spokesman for the aspirations and demands of the miners and a defender of their interests, and the miners expressed their lack of confidence in it. After stormy debates, which lasted 10 hours, a new trade union committee was reelected and a new STK [Worker Collective Soviet]. Trade union committees of the 50th Anniversary of the USSR and the "Gukovskaya" mines—were forced to give up their positions ahead of time. A knotty problem developed here that the former trade union committees could not resolve, and they lost their authority with the miners.

Why did such a situation develop? The general worsening of the situation in the country had an effect—the shortage of consumer goods, food products, and the like. Plus an inadequate activity of the local authorities and the timidity of the trade union committees. Half measures were taken there where it was necessary clearly and unequivocally to declare that the interests of the worker collective were violated and that this could no longer be tolerated. Where the trade union committees are not afraid of taking a resolute stand on the side of the workers and to support their legal demands, their authority is not falling, but growing. At the mine "Anthracite," for example, the administration cannot cope with the principled positions of the trade union committee, which is headed by Vladimir Valentinovich Khamyuk. The miners value honest and frank manly discussion, and they do not tolerate the desire to oblige ours and yours, and attempts to straddle the fence. Overall, they expect this kind of independence and consistency from the trade unions in defending the vital interests and rights of the workers. The trade unions must become not organizations for the workers, but a workers' organization.

2. The independence and defensibility of the trade union committees must be strengthened. It is unseemly for trade union committees to be in management's pocket! They should be protected not only by their own worker collectives and by their solidarity (which, undoubtedly, is very important), but also by the law. It is important to emphasize this now, when a discussion is going on about the draft of the new Law on the Rights of Trade Unions. For this, among other measures, as our trade union activists believe, it is necessary to give the right to express a lack of confidence in the administration for failure to fulfill measures for the protection of workers not only to trade union committees that have the status of a raykom [rayon party committee], as is the case now, but to all local trade union organizations. So that an administrator who treats labor legislation liberally and who does not consider the demands of the trade unions, and ignores them, knows that the worker collective whose interests the trade union committee represents, will not tolerate him. The trade union committee must have the capability of clearly expressing this, their will. It is not accidental that such demands on the discharge of managers of quite diverse ranks,(who do not warrant the trust of the workers), arose here and there in the course of recent strikes, and in many cases were satisfied.

One more thing. It is enough for trade union committees to persuade the negligent and irresponsible mine foremen, chiefs of sectors, and other specialists to observe the provisions of the collective contract, the laws, etc., and to engender documents with the invariable "to demand," and "to oblige"—it is necessary to give trade union committees the right to levy fines on such mining specialists—from 30 to 50 rubles—for violations similar to that now being done by technical labor inspectors.

It is necessary to protect those trade union managers more resolutely who take principally uncompromising positions when a matter concerns the interests of the workers who do not make a deal with their conscience in order to ensure a cushy job for themselves in the future, if they are not elected for a new term. A law has to be established: That a former trade union worker can be discharged only with the consent of a superior trade union organ—regardless of the period when the worker left the trade union position. In this way, we will deprive the zealous administrators who harbor malice toward trade union activists who gave them trouble at one time, even the slightest opportunity to settle scores with the principle chairmen and members of trade union committees. We will defend them and secure them against persecution and from reprisals.

Finally, it is necessary to get rid of formalism and the dominance of all kinds of instructions. It is necessary to trust local trade union organizations more. Local trade union committees and trade union organizations on the whole know how they should act. They do not need petty guardianship—it only hinders action.

Shalayev Regards Plenum Mood

LD0509224189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 5 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] The present time and urgent tasks of the trade unions—such was the agenda of a plenum of AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council Of Trade Unions] which opened in Moscow today. Over to our commentator Aleksandr Krutov.

[Krutov] There has never been such an agenda for the trade unions, at least in my memory. Indeed the composition of the participants in the plenum—just look at it: a member of the Politburo and members of strike committees, people's deputies, leaders of AUCCTU, and representatives of labor collectives. What are the participants in the plenum discussing? The crisis of confidence of the working class in the sociopolitical institutions, and how the trade unions can respond to it. What should be the trade unions' attitude to strikes? Will the measures taken by the government help to improve the economy? What sort of cooperative movement do the people vote for? Has the time come to open labor exchanges? Indeed the report by comrade Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU was not traditionally smooth.

[Shalayev] The working class and working people today clearly do not like how perestroyka is going, at what pace, and primarily the incompletedness, the half-hearted nature of the measures to implement economic reform. At various levels of management, under all sorts of pretexts the transfer to new forms of management—financial autonomy and self-management—are being held back. The legal rights of labor collectives are being trampled on. At the plenum today we must once again clearly state that no one has the right to impose on the trade unions functions not proper to them, to make them work for other public formations, for the administrative and economic staff, and thereby distract them from fulfilling their main tasks—the defense of the legitimate rights of the working man. [passage omitted] [video shows Krutov; Shalayev and others speaking at rostrum in conference hall; brief shot of Chebrikov (?and Voronin) on the platform]

Vorotnikov Airs Views on Nationalities Issue

Part 1

LD3108111789 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 30 Aug 89

[First installment of three-part discussion between correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov and Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet; date, place not specified]

[Text] [Announcer] The CPSU platform for the solution of the nationalities' question is being actively examined in the Soviet Union. Together with recommendations and proposals it will be the basis for a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee session on the nationalities' question, which will be held in September. Our special correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov asked Vitaliy Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman to tell us how this platform was prepared and about the nationalities', political and economic problems of the Russian Federation.

The first question concerned the CPSU platform on the solution of the nationalities question itself. How was it prepared? Is this a compromising version which is suitable for all the republics or simply a proposal for the center?

[Begin recording] [Vorotnikov in Russian fading to Czech translation] I think it is simply a political directive and I believe it should be assessed as such. It is a general political directive to be elaborated on further at plenums. To come to such a complex session simply with a report, without any previous fundamental assessment of the main problems in the sphere of internationalities relations in our country, would probably not be right. It would limit the possibilities to adopt decisions. Thus, the idea was born to drafting a political program so remarks, proposals, and wishes could be voiced. Then, with this a person can come to a session and hold a discussion, which could outline the further way and policy of our party and our state in the development of the Leninist nationalities' policy.

[Terekhov] All those in CPSU leadership, have they agreed with the thesis of the platform?

[Vorotnikov] Yes. This is a totally united approach, but it was not an immediate one, however. The present text of the program is not the first version. There have been discussions and a number of points of the program have been clarified. Despite this I cannot say that it gives a full answer to all the questions. After all, we have not been after such a goal anyway. This is, above all, and I repeat it, a main political directive. We have to elaborate it now further, naturally, taking into account every individual republic. We, in the Russian Federation, are now working on this.

[Terekhov] A few words about the nationalities' question in the Russian Federation: It is the largest republic in the country with the largest number of nationalities. Despite this, there have not been any nationalities' arguments, or at least we do not know about them. What is the reason for this? Is it really because there are no nationalities problems in the republic or simply, the public does not know about them?

[Vorotnikov] One cannot say that we do not have internationalities problems and that the public does not know about them; Vitaliy Vorotnikov is replying. Problems do, naturally, exist and the public knows about them. Perhaps they do not manifest themselves so acutely as in other areas. Problems do exist, nevertheless. They were also discussed at the Congress of People's Deputies. First of all, there are problems conected with Soviet Germans. This is a purely Russian problem. There is the problem of the Crimean Tatars, this is a Russian and also Ukrainian problem. Questions are arising also in the northern Caucasus, for example, in Dagestan and in the Checheno-Ingushetilya Autonomous Republic, and there are also problems in the north of the republic. When I went to Magadan I dealt especially with this question there. For example, one of the problems of the Soviet people: the new settlers are beginning to push out inhabitants in the tundra, in Chukotka and in other places. They are pushing them out of places where they used to hunt and fish, from their own territories where they have been huntilng, fishing, and reindeer breeding.

Certain categories of people are showing a special activity: They are not attracted by hunting as such but they are trying to sell what they have caught through other state channels and thus make an extra profit in this way. They are becoming more active, more daring, and more aggressive. The local inhabitants are more humble and modest; they observe their local traditions, do not speak much, and probably are not so active. The settlers' activities do harm them. The intelligentsia of these nations feel it, above all. We have been discussing this and we are preparing to draft a number of programs that would ensure the preservation of the traditional skills characteristic for this or that area and at the same time the careful creation of modern living conditions. This is complex. For example, there are reindeer breeders. It is a nomadic life; they use yarangas, the portable dwellings. Reindeers graze here today and somewhere else tomorrow. This is a nomadic life; they have to teach their children such a way of life. They have problems connected with food; their food is traditional and thus problems arise connected with the care for health and demographic problems. Nationalities' problems are practically everywhere, that is also in our large autonomous republics, oblasts, and autonomous okrugs. This is why we will have a lot to talk about at the CPSU Central Committee plenum devoted to the internationalities' relations also in the framework of Russia. We will have to strive for this problem to be solved, for the leadership and the relevant party and soviet organizations of those oblasts and republics to take them into account. [end recording]

[Announcer] You have heard the first program in the series "Russia's problems! nationalities, political and economic." It has dealt with some unsol ed nationalities' question in Russia. The next program will be broadcast tomorrow at the same time. Vitaliy Vorotnikov will answer questions of our correspondent concerning the plan of organizations in Russia, the CPSU itself, and the setting up of managerial institutions similar to those in other republics.

Part 2

LD0109150689 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1700 GMT 31 Aug 89

[Second installment of three-part discussion between correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov and Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet; date, place not specified]

[Announcer] We are broadcasting the second installment of the discussion between [correspondent] Vyacheslav Terekhov and Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. The leading official of this largest union republic talked about various problems which exist in Russia [RSFSR]. This discussion will analyze questions of the republic's political sovereignty. Some deputies in their speeches—both at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet—expressed their dissatisfaction with the fact that the Russian Federation has no party organization of its own, that it has no Central Committee of its own, its own management institutions, as in the other union republics. How do you see it?

[Begin recording] [Vorotnikov in Russian fading to Czech] I think that some addresses and publications on this topic show incomplete understanding of the true situation and a lack of knowledge about what the government and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet are doing. What is involved is that the problems, connected with expanding the soveriegn rights of our republic and with setting up a whole range of structures which do not exist at present, have been disturbing us for a long time. Why has it been discussed? I have been closely concerned since 1975 with the affairs of this republic and know that the leadership of the RSFSR has asked these questions many times. However, they have always said: Why are you in a hurry, what good will it do?

Another point is that in our country and also abroad the USSR and Russia have been considered identical. That is why, before RSFSR can lay claim to extra sovereign rights, this must be reflected in mutual relations with other republics. This means that we must somehow absorb all of the processes which take place in the country. If everything is all right and everybody is satisfied, the republics are happy. If some negative processes are taking place in the country, then Russia is blamed first of all, inasmuch as it carries a lot of weight and is, therefore, to blame for all disasters. That is why the question of the political structure and the questions of administrative structure and mass organizations and economic reforms have been discussed many times. This concerns also the regional financial autonomy. [end recording]

[Announcer] Will there be a Communist Party of Russia, the reporter asks.

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] No, we do not intend to establish a Communist Party of Russia, which would exist separately from the CPSU, but the communists of Russia must have the opportunity to meet and to discuss their questions; that means to regularly organize Russian conferences. According to us, it is necessary for this conference to elect or approve a bureau of the Central Committee of the Party for questions of Russia. As to the apparatus, practice has demonstrated that the actions of concurrent apparatuses in the Central Committee for Russia and for the USSR evoke only misunderstanding, arguements, confrontation and so on. That is why we think that our support will be constituted by a unified apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. It should be the same in the Komsomol, trade unions and number of other mass organizations—we should see to it that they are Russian. As to the other management structures, the burning issue is protection of rights. We have a Russian prosecution office, a Russian court, Russian judiciary system, we have a Russian arbitration, but we have not a Russian Ministry of Interior. A strange situation thus arises—an oblast has an oblast administration of the interior, there is a kray administration of the interior. It is directly responsible to the union ministry. There is no such organ in Russia. We have submitted such a proposal many times. Now, however, the problem is more difficult than we can handle and we are resolutely asking for our own Ministry of the Interior. It is not only indispensable in the interest of the republic, but also in the interest of the entire society. The organs of the union ministry should act as federal organs and that means that militias should be a city organ. One should not be an obstacle for the other. If we create a Ministry of the Interior of Russia it does not mean that the union ministry will have nothing to do. It will be left with the institutions, criminology, target aims which it will have to solve, such as, for example drug addiction, group criminality, and so on. We, then, have to observe order in the street. We need militia at observation stations and militia guards. We must work with [word indistinct] and solve a multitude of further questions, beginning with the passport department. All this belongs to the competence of the local and not the union organs. [end recording]

Part 3

LD0209134189 Moscow International Service in Slovak 1500 GMT 1 Sep 89

[Third and final installment of three-part discussion between correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov and Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet; date, place not specified]

[Announcer] Dear listeners, Moscow Radio continues to acquaint you with the views of Vitaliy Vorotnikov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, on topical problems of the Russian Federation. This time we shall talk about the new law on the election of people's deputies of the republic. Draft bills have been published in the republic on election of people's deputiews of the RSFSR. These proposals surprised many people by their deviations from the Union law on elections. For example, social organizations, according to the draft, have no right independently to elect people's deputies. How did the idea of such cardinal changes arise? Were not the leading officials of party organizations alarmed by this point?

[Begin recording] [Vorotnikov in Russian fading into superimposed Slovak translation] Naturally, the path of a definitive solution of an entire complex of problems connected with preparing the draft law on election to the Supreme Soviet and the local Soviets of the Russian Federation was not easy, Vitaliy Vorotnikov says. There were many struggles, many arguments. The most important thing, however, was that we felt that in the Union law on elections there are shortcomings and mistakes. In order to check out the opinions of the people from various strata of our society, we sent proposals to the appropriate places, we discussed them in oblasts, regions and autonomous regions. First of all there were doubts—is the system of two chambers necessary? This is not an easy question for Russia. For example, for the union, setting up the system of two chambers is a stage which has been overcome, while these two chambers are composed of representatives of the Union Republics. In our country, however, autonomous formations occupy only a part of Russia. Only 18 percent of inhabitants live there. Therefore, we used to say in the beginning, how could we—for 18 percent of the population—set up the Soviet of Nationalities? That would mean that the Soviet of Nationalities would form, compared to the Soviet of the Republic, a mere one-fifth. This was a reason for doubt. How can we find such a formula which would allow for all the proportions to be adhered to? We do not want a situation in which the Soviet of Nationalities is composed either of the majority of Russians or simply of persons of different nationalities. We found a solution where all the proportions are maintained, both in proposing to the Congress and in creating chambers. National-territorial constituencies are being set up by each autonomous republic, independent of the number of the population, having the same number of autonomous districts, and each chamber consists not only of representatives of each autonomy, republic, oblast or autonomous district, but also of every territory that is a representative of each oblast and region. Proportions of representations in the Soviet of Nationalities are thus the same. Besides, each territorial autonomous formation will have its representatives also in the Soviet of the Republic, despite the fact that the constituencies in the elections to this chamber will be created according to the number of the population. [end recording]

[Announcer] Why was there a decision to abolish elections of deputies to social organizations?

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] We decided that it was, after all, necessary to renounce any advantages granted by elections of deputies representing mass organizations. When we began to discuss this terminology in detail, we found that representatives of the so- called mass organizations, which were elected to the congress, in fact are not mass organizations. This means that one had to carry out a certain selection. According to which principle? Where should the party go, to which organization? The Academy of Sciences or the organization of stamp collectors? Naturally, it is not very good if the deputies, representing some kind of mass organization, are not, in fact, being elected by this organization, but are elected only by a close circle of their members—plenary session or, at best, a conference. We received a sufficient number of proposals concerning the need to change this situation. That is why we are proposing that mass organizations have the right to nominate candidates who will then compete in elections as equal partners. [end recording]

[Announcer] Many party organizations will, no doubt, be dissatisfied.

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] Some comrades expressed doubts as to the correctness of this decision, Vitaliy Vorotnikov said. But they were individuals, and not only party officials. It was discussed also by representatives of other social groups. They asked why we, in the Soviet Union, deviate from the thesis of an all-Union law. Besides, we reject constituency meetings. However, we based our decision on the fact that the theses of the Union law on elections will change. [end recording]

[Announcer] We have often heard that Russia is being blamed for being conservative. Is this the case?

[Begin Vorotnikov recording] Yes, I was blamed for being conservative too. I should like to add that life is continually teaching us. We are not aware that, the more openness, the more there is democracy, the more we learn and acquire new labor conditions—not in some kind of a framework, but in a much broader context—so much the better. People can talk about their problems and we can also discuss these questions with them and understand them. After all, we all wish for a better future. [end recording]

'Foreign Debut' of Supreme Soviet Discussed

18070745 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
26 Aug 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Article by Stanislav Kondrashov: "It is No Disgrace to Learn"]

[Text] The new Supreme Soviet, which engages not in empty ritual but in real activity, has made its debut not only before the Soviet people but also before the entire world, although its second, "foreign," debut did not receive one-tenth as much of our attention: We were too absorbed in our own problems, our own crisis, our own first experiments with democracy. Even our international experts (an example is Ye.M. Primakov) are moving to the domestic front—not without the hope that in moving along our own parliamentary path their international knowledge and skills of international communication will be put to use.

Nonetheless the "foreign" debut of the Supreme Soviet is extremely important. On the broad plane the new attitude in the world toward the Soviet Union, above all in the West, depends on how serious and how realistic they consider our movement in the direction of democracy to be. To what extent does the Soviet parliament speak for the people, that is, without prompting, with their voice? On the narrow plane we are speaking about a new kind of communications with other parliaments, about interaction with them in the interests of peace among nations and thus protection of the interests of our own people. Ultimately it is communications among democratically elected parliaments that are the most authoritative form of national diplomacy, for their participants are not only independent but also constitutionally elected representatives of the people.

People are looking attentively at our new parliament: For example, does it really have the authority to determine expenditures for defense purposes and, which is decisive here, to take into account public opinion, the mass voter, or will it continue to follow the lead of the directive organs?

A part of the "foreign" debut and our new look at one another was the recent trip to the Soviet Union by a delegation of the Armed Forces Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives headed by Les Aspin. This influential congressman is actively preparing the soil for American-Soviet cooperation. Taking advantage of the possibilities of the new time, in July he invited Marshal S.F. Akhromeyev to give a public speech on Capitol Hill, which produced a real furor in American political circles. And in August along with 13 colleagues from his committee Aspin was the guest of the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Questions of Defense and State Security (KOGB) and its chairman V.L. Lapygin.

Openness without further ado—this might describe the start of the 12-day trip. It began in the GDR with a visit to a motorized infantry division of the Western Group of Forces. Right there—and again without any ado!—the Americans were able to act on their suspiciousness which is still far from dispelled. In the division they visited they discovered a regiment of a tank division which, according to Moscow's announcement, had been unilaterally withdrawn from the GDR along with three other tank divisions. It must be admitted that the congressmen immediately suspected another trick of the "Soviets," another discrepancy between word and deed. But they were mistaken. No, it was not a trick and not a deception. As was explained to them later in Moscow, it was simply that the motorized infantry regiment from the tank division that had been withdrawn had merged with the motorized infantry division, from which we then removed the tank regiment—and withdrew from the country! This was done in order to remove more (not fewer!) tanks and to reinforce not the offensive but the defensive nature of the remaining formations. And it was not Soviet trickery but the Americans' neglectful attitude of the toward information that cause the misunderstanding because as early as January during Aspin's preceding visit to Moscow the "reciprocal exchange" of regiments in divisions was explained to the American military men who accompanied him.

Behind this specific misunderstanding there is something larger and more general—the history of Soviet-American relations. In a conversation in the KOGB the Americans emphasized: Yes, of course we are experiencing a new stage in our relations, but the long sad history is not forgotten immediately and suspicion and mistrust are still alive and will continue to be. The Soviet side agreed: No, confidence is not created all at once.

And so the past is alive, but an increasingly bold and reasonable glasnost prevails in the present. Not all of the "requests" of the Americans were satisfied—they were not shown, for example, the plant for producing tanks and SS-24 intercontinental missiles (the American names of our classified missiles are still retained). But it will not be a paradox to say that the congressmen received less than they wished but much more than they expected—including the plant for destroying chemical weapons in Chapayevsk, an inspection of the Energiya-Buran space rocket system in Baykonur (they were the first foreign guests to be at the center of the assembly of the Energiya rocket carriers), and they were also the first foreigners to visit the base for SS-11 intercontinental ballistic missiles in Ivanovo Oblast, and in Troitsk near Moscow—they visited the powerful laser installation where they were convinced that it had nothing to do with the Star Wars plans.

A return visit to the United States is planned for January-February, and the American side does not want to end up with egg on its face after promising the Soviet parliament equal openness.

And so a working contact has been established. But its essence does not lie in excursions to closed military facilities, regardless of how impressive this symbol of perestroyka may be.

The international situation is changing for the better, and one of the proofs of this is that purely practical American politicians are making new assessments for the future. At the same time as Les Aspin and the members of his committee were visiting Moscow were visiting the Soviet Union, the chairman of the Senate Armed Forces Committee Sam Nunn and another senator, John McCain, published a significant article. Drawing conclusions from the changed situation, they are calling for and achieving a "more just distribution of military commitments"—so that the United States will have as little as possible of the burden, so that Western Europe will not shirk its burden, and Japan with its increasing economic strength will increasingly relieve the American burden. This is one of the main directions in which the U.S. Congress will obviously be working.

Another example. The American business magazine FORTUNE, which is far from idle dreams, thinks that by the year 2000 the U.S. military budget can be reduced by one-third—to 200 billion dollars from 300 billion dollars. Another assessment for the future is the optimistic evaluation of the international situation. We are already reducing our Armed Forces and defense budget which the government thinks can be reduced by a factor of 1.5-2 by 1995 if agreements are concluded concerning offensive weapons and conventional forces in Europe.

This is a situation in which the Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress and also other Western parliaments can cooperate. This cooperation is an important inadequate element that needs to be added to the high-level meetings and the permanent contacts of the foreign political departments of the two countries which are arranging exchanges between military circles, not to mention various public ties.

If one takes into account the fact that the Americans have two centuries of parliamentary practice and we have 2 months, we cannot get along without this cooperation and our side cannot get by without borrowing this experience and rationally assimilating it. V.L. Lapygin expressed a desire to take significant advantage of the experience of L. Aspin's committee. So the work is getting started with the experts and there is much to learn.

Here is a view from the outside of the initial state of affairs. It is from a WASHINGTON POST correspondent, Molly Moore, who accompanied the American delegation: "The lack of a meeting hall was the least of the problems of the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security. It does not have its own staff of workers and it is not sure of how it should be organized. Committee members say that they will require access to secret military and intelligence information but they have no idea about how or where to store it. They say that they want the right to recommend changes in military expenditures but they have never seen a budget before and they have practically no idea of how to restructure it."

Of course a view from the outside is not always kind and advice from outsiders can be inappropriate and evoke natural opposition: We know what we are doing. But there are important and obvious things that we know ourselves, but speculatively, while for them they are reinforced by many years of experience. Here is one: The parliament is worthy of its name only when its members have independence of judgment, their own view on things, and both the ability and the persistence to defend it in the event of disagreements (and they are inevitable) with the executive power and the government. Aspin reminded us of this. The Americans also advised us not to skimp on a staff not only of technical personnel but also of independent experts who should provide the legislators with an independent approach to various issues.

One mind is a good thing but two are better. This is not a question of confidence but of selection of the variant which best provides for nationwide and not departmental relations. Trust but verify! When the government suggests cutting military expenditures by 1995 by a factor of 1.5-2 the Supreme Soviet has the right to verify that this figure is optimal: Why such a round figure? Did they not just pull it out of the hat? In the shorter run the Supreme Soviet has the right to demand a detailed substantiation of cuts in military expenditures that have already been made as well. Here a comparison with the Americans is quite appropriate: The greatest power for the parliament is the "power of the pocketbook, the right to consider the budget in the minutest detail and approve it, including the defense budget.

The U.S. Congress is extremely meticulous in this respect. The work of the Armed Forces Committee of the House of Representatives confirms this fact. For reference, a couple of words about its area of competence: general questions of the U.S. defense policy, functions of parliamentary supervision of the activity of the Pentagon (general, budget, and other issues), questions of allotting money for U.S. military programs, including scientific research and experimental design work, wages, pensions, personnel, and other issues related to the armed forces. The committee also exercises parliamentary supervision over the negotiations which are being conducted by the administration in the area of arms limitation such as those that are now being conducted in Geneva and Vienna. When discussing the military budget for the 1990 fiscal year committee members were interested in the fate of the programs for strategic modernization, a number of programs in the area of armed forces, and questions of the profitability of the arms procurement systems and increasing the effectiveness of the Pentagon's activity.

The committee regularly holds hearings, usually public ones. Recently they have considered questions for restoring the environment in places damaged by military facilities, the mobilization readiness of the U.S. Armed Forces, military programs, the state of affairs with the conventional arms negotiations in Europe, stability in the area of conventional arms in the European military theater, the distribution of the burden of military expenditures between the United States and their NATO allies, unilateral reductions of the USSR Armed Forces, their restructuring, and so forth.

In the discussions in the Supreme Soviet the American delegation asked how the KOGB would discuss budgeted military expenditures—as a whole or for individual programs, taking into account their cost and expediency. From the responses one gets the impression that they have not really thought about this yet and that there is a Russian temptation to rely on the empirical course of things and to feel their way along. In one discussion the congressmen were told that so far the budget was being considered in "consolidated form." In another a different explanation was given: both as a whole and in terms of certain of the most essential programs.

With the powerful tradition of being secretive about such questions and the significance of our military-industrial complex and taking into account that a number of members of the Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security have emerged from its center, one can assume that the establishment of Soviet parliamentarianism in this essential and sensitive area will not proceed uniformly or smoothly. And so it is even more important to direct this new business in the channel of professionalism that is worthy and capable of defending national interests and will not give in to the interests of departmental dilettantism.

Internal Affairs Ministry's Trushin on Crime Data

LD0409224189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1745 GMT on 4 September broadcasts the 11-minute "Ministry of Internal Affairs News" program, presented by USSR Deputy Minister of Internal Affairs V.P. Trushin.

Trushin opens the program saying: "Today, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] has summarized data on the crime rate over the 8 months of this year. An analysis of the criminological situation shows that the state of the operational situation continues to remain complex. Over these 8 months, 1,518,000 crimes have been registered. Of course, the state of affairs differs from region to region. However, one can observe a rise in the crime rate in all the republics, and in Lithuanian and Estonia it has exceeded 50 percent." Serious crime is up 40.8 percent, with 166 such crimes being committed last week alone.

Trushin then gives specific examples: one a failed armed robbery in Leningrad, the other a kidnapping in Moscow. He then goes on: "As before, the operational situation is being made more difficult by interethnic tensions. A particularly difficult situation in this respect continues in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjacent regions. During the week, 16 attacks on motor transportation and 6 arson attacks were carried out. As a result of clashes, 1 person was killed and 60 were injured. Firearms frequently are used during conflicts."

Trushin states that the temporary committees in the fight against crime have begun work everywhere. In many areas, the militia is acting more resolutely. More than 80 percent of the murders committed last week were solved within 24 hours. The militia increasingly is using arms to prevent crime and when capturing criminals. "During the week, weapons were used 22 times. Three criminals were killed; the rest were detained. In accordance with existing rules, the legitimacy of the use of arms is determined and investigated by the Procuracy. A final conclusion will be made later. However, according to preliminary information, one can say that weapons were used legitimately in all cases. Unfortunately, there also were losses on our side. One employee died and three were injured.

"The decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet, obliging the investigative bodies and courts not to allow any indulgence toward dangerous criminals, is being put into practice. This is of fundamental significance and is supported by the public. The numerous cases of liberalism with regard to persons who have committed crimes, especially serious ones, met with the just dissatisfaction of Soviet people. Now the state of affairs is being corrected. Arrests and detentions are being used more widely against recidivists, the users of force, and the organizers of criminal groups, and the evaluations by courts are harsher." Trushin cites two cases in which the death penalty was given.

"Efforts in the campaign against organized crime are being increased, and the special subunits set up for this purpose have begun operating more actively." He cites examples of cases of such crime in Moscow oblast over the last week and explains that although cooperatives are most often the victims of extortion, it has been observed recently that criminals are moving toward setting up cooperatives themselves or are becoming members of existing cooperatives. He cites a specific example to prove this point.

The fight against drugs remains at the center of attention. The press covered the recent operation against the producers and distributors of narcotics. "During this operation, in Chuya Valley alone, where there are more than 150,000 hectares of wild hemp, 562 producers and carrier of narcotics were detained, and in 1 month, 83 distributers were exposed." More than 2 tonnes of narcotic substances was seized during the operation as a whole. Although the planting of oil-producing poppies and all types of hemp was banned in 1987, last year 58,000 plantations were discovered and 22,000 this year. Trushin reminds people that ignorance of the law is no excuse.

"The Ministry of Internal Affairs has stressed often that the rise in the crime rate is conditioned to a considerable extent by the increase in burglaries. Lately, personal computers have become the objects of criminal offenses."

Trushin then looks briefly at crimes in the economic sphere. "Mismanagement, negligence, and the often unprofessional actions of militia employees create a favorable basis for various types of machinations. Departmental control has been weakened sharply and the inspection apparatus has been cut, which of course, has not helped to strengthen the fight against thefts and bribery. This year, 181,000 crimes in this sphere have been solved, including 5,900 large and especially large thefts." He cites recent cases of the theft of alcohol from a vodka factory in Uzbekistan, a seizure of 3.8 kg of gold stolen from gold-extraction enterprises at Yakutsk airport by the Department for Combatting the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation, and the uncovering of an extensive group speculating in jewellery.

In conclusion, Trushin says: "I would like to stress that a month has passed since the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet was adopted. Its influence is being felt increasingly and can be traced in the practical approaches in the fight against crime, and undoubtedly, will have an effect on its results. However, this requires much dogged work. This is how we see our task today. Thank you for your attention."

Moscow Party Club Aims, Structure Outlined

PM0309140089 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 13 Aug 89 p 3

[Article by special correspondent Irina Inoveli: "Operating Within the Framework of the Existing CPSU Norms and Statutes...."]

[Text] "The essence of the political system was and is the party, which, under the USSR Constitution, is the leading and guiding force of our society. It is therefore the party that bears full responsibility for everything that happens, and without radical changes in the CPSU things will not get moving. However, in the 5th year of perestroyka the party's laggardness in relation to society in the cause of democratization is exacerbating the crisis in the former and dangerously retarding changes in the latter. The fact that in 1988 300,000 people left the party's ranks means that the situation that has taken shape can no longer be tolerated. Yes, the party is seriously ill, and our common task is immediately to begin to treat it. This is absolutely necessary, because the CPSU's political significance is invaluable and as of today it is the only 'load-bearing structure,' the only social integrator."

These words are from a message to all party members from the Moscow Party Club "Communists for Perestroyka." Many people will say they have never heard of this club. I knew nothing about it either, until I singled it out for special attention among the many and varied informal associations now operating in Moscow. Why special—I should explain.

The upsurge in the masses' social and political activeness prompted by perestroyka found visible expression in genuinely voluntary or, as we usually say now, informal special-interest associations. In cases where this interest is focused in the political sphere various kinds of associations spring up that usually represent, so to speak, an alternative in relation to the soviets and the party. The Moscow Party Club "Communists for Perestroyka" caught my attention in the first instance because it does not counterpose itself to the CPSU, but, as one of its documents records, "operating within the framework of the existing CPSU norms and statutes," it seeks effective ways out of the crisis. It is no secret that the revelations in recent years of the corrupt nature of a number of party leaders up to the very highest echelon of power and the difficulties in our economy, which was all but exhausted under the burden of the administrative edict system, have done nothing to help strengthen the party's authority in the working people's eyes. But the crisis of confidence that it is experiencing today prompts different people who are united by their party membership to act in different ways: Some continue to adhere to the old forms and methods of party work, unable or unwilling to take the plunge and break through the stereotypes of the past; others declare their position by leaving the party; others again choose what is, in my view, the most effective way of acting by helping the party to acquire a new face—pure, bold, and open....

It was this last group who decided, a few months ago, to set up a city party club in Moscow. Let me explain especially for the benefit of those who have their suspicions: Could this be some kind of faction, some kind of cunning opposition which will bide its time and suddenly change its "label"? Fears of this kind are in vain. Foreseeing that they would arise in some party members and nonparty people, the club "Communists for Perestroyka" decided to give an account of itself by means of a kind of questionnaire made up of questions and answers. These may perhaps be interesting to those Communists and nonparty people in our republic who are also now seeking ways out of the general crisis afflicting the country.

So, what is the party club? It is an independent association of Communists who advocate the radical democratic reform of the CPSU. An association—let us emphasize—not based on the territorial or production principle, but on a shared special program. This will be discussed in a moment, but first it is not without interest to note that party clubs are not an alien phenomenon to our party, they sprang up among emigres in the years of the first, 1905 revolution. Thus, for instance, in January 1905 the Geneva Party Club of Bolsheviks was set up, and social democrats of all currents were allowed to take part in its debates. After the 1905 revolution party clubs sprang up in Russia too: under the St Petersburg, Moscow, and Nizhniy Novgorod Russian Social Democratic Workers Party committees.

The forerunner of the present Moscow City Party Club was the interclub party group that sprang up in Moscow prior to the 19th All-Union Party Conference and consisted of Communists belonging to the informal associations "Democratic Perestroyka," "Memorial," and others.

What are the ideological principles of the Moscow City Party Club? They include scientific socialism or—in other words—renewed, modern Marxism, which presupposes first and foremost the rejection of the dogmatic interpretation of Marxism which became widespread in the foregoing period of the country's history. Ideological reform, from the viewpoint of the Communists who have joined together in the party club (their ages range from 25 to 60, the main backbone is the higher educational institution and scientific intelligentsia, but there are also workers, servicemen, and pensioners), is impossible without—and I quote—"truthful recognition of the enormous responsibility that the Communist Party bears for the results and consequences of the totalitarian regime in our country..., without a scientific definition of the aims of the reforms being carried out—the final elimination of the totalitarian regime based on the party and state apparatus' monopoly of power, ownership, and thought and the means to transmit it, and the transition to a model of democratic socialism founded on the paramountcy of common human interests and values and on the principles of democracy, humanism, pluralism, social justice, nonviolence, and tolerance of other philosophies and social systems."

...Around the middle of July, at the end of the working day, I went to Sevastopolskiy Rayon party committee [raykom] in Moscow: It has, so to speak, taken under its wing the young city party club, making a conference hall available to it after six in the evening, and also allocating an office for club work.

The 3 hours and more spent at the weekly party club session was packed with speeches and reports that were highly charged in terms of thought and their nontraditional approach to the questions under discussion. For my part, let me note that if the discussion at all meetings in primary party organizations and all party committee plenums was like this—keenly critical and constructive, profound and wide-ranging in formulating problems, bold in putting forward proposals, and permeated with commitment to boosting the party's authority—things would be going much better today than they are. Let me also note that a senior official from Sevastopolskiy party raykom sat alongside the party club leaders at the presidium table. This party committee seeks not confrontation, but dialogue with the informals, and that is, of course, the only acceptable path today. But clearly not all party committees understand this: It emerged from a speech by one club member that their recent meeting with the apparatus and secretaries of the primary organizations of Krasnopresnenskiy party raykom did not help to "build bridges," the discussion was not a success. The informals from the party club were trying to explain their ways of overcoming the crisis situation in the party, but the reply came: What crisis are you talking about, there is no crisis. We have not had any such directive.... (The bankruptcy of this position has become quite clear now that the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the Conduct of Reports and Elections in Party Organizations in 1989" has been published, stating with courageous frankness: "The party came under critical fire because of the laggardness of many party committees and organizations in relation to the processes taking place in society... The reasons for the decline in the authority of elected organs, party workers, and communists in a number of regions should be investigated.")

But in another raykom—Leningradskiy—the meeting with the party ideological aktiv prompted, in the view of the party club leaders, mutual interest on the part of the two sides and was undoubtedly constructive.

I had a talk with the party club coordinator, as he calls himself, Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Lysenko, during a break in the session. I asked:

[Inoveli] "Why do you members of the party club not create a new, Marxist party, why do you prefer to work within the CPSU?"

[Lysenko] "The formation of a new party is a sectarian step that will not lead to success. The emergence of such an association, in present conditions, would be like the 'Democratic Union,' which is more like a caricature of a political party. We do not intend to leave the Communist Party, we want to struggle for the minds of Communists, for the radicalization of the CPSU from within the party, believing that the majority will follow its leading forces. Let the Stalinists and conservatives leave the party. To hand over society's most powerful political organization to the covert and overt opponents of perestroyka today would be fatal to the reforms that have begun. It is necessary to struggle for the CPSU, and we are ready for that struggle."

The party club is structurally divided into sections—ideological, political, legal, organizational, sociological. The ideological section does the most intensive work, and that is probably only natural in the initial stage of the club's operation. Its members are now working for the convocation of an extraordinary 28th CPSU Congress. How is this being done? First, the party club's appeal to the country's Communists on this question has already been distributed in more than 100 cities and is read out at meetings and rallies. Second, work is under way to extend the ranks of the party club itself and create branches in rayons and at enterprises in Moscow and Moscow Oblast. Third, meetings are held with the party aktiv and party committee apparatus workers with a view to creating rayon party discussion clubs. Fourth, every club member works actively in the primary party organization to which he belongs. So the decisions of the party organizations of Moscow State University, the Moscow Aviation Institute, the Moscow Physical and Technical Institute, and others on the question of the need to convene an extraordinary party congress were also contributed to by members of the city party club, which recently began to publish its own VESTNIK.

From the Moscow Party Club appeal to the country's Communists: "The political acceleration of our time makes the 5-year interval between congresses, which dates from the age of stagnation, absurd; the party's highest organ should meet before the end of this year, before distrust in the CSPU increases to such an extent that the proposed measure will become ineffective. We propose that the following questions be included on the congress agenda: 1. The causes of the crisis in the party and society and ways of surmounting it; 2. The transfer of power to the soviets and the CPSU's new place in the changing political system; 3. The democratization of intraparty life and new CPSU Statutes; 4. Elections of new party leadership organs.

"From the outset we associate the proposal for an extraordinary congress firmly with the democratization of the procedure for electing delegates. The appointment of delegates on the old model, under the existing authoritarian instruction on elections, could lead to acute social upheavals and the destruction of the CPSU.

"Comrades! At this time of crisis it must be recognized that responsibility for the future of the country and party rests not only with the leadership, but with every one of us! We ask you to discuss our appeal at your own party meetings and adopt a resolution on the extraordinary convocation of a city conference and on the repeal of the instruction on elections, with a view to democratizing the procedure for electing delegates to the congress."

For those who are interested in the work experience of the Moscow City Party Club "Communists for Perestroyka," I will give you its address: Party Club Council, Room 101, Sevastopolskiy CPSU Raykom, 28/4 Sevastopolskiy Prospekt, Moscow, 113209.

Improved Quality of CPSU Membership Urged

PM0509134189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Aug 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Party Replenishment. Only Sincere Advocates of Perestroyka Should Be CPSU Members"]

[Text] Some 60 years ago, when the question of whether Soviet power would exist was essentially being decided in the fierce struggle against interventionists and the internal counterrevolution, V.I. Lenin wrote: "We need new party members not for publicity's sake but for serious work." Calling on the most conscientious workers and peasants to join the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), he also considered it necessary to immediately make it clear that: "We do not promise you any advantage from this, we are calling you to difficult work—the work of state building. If you are sincere advocates of communism, tackle this work boldly, do not be afraid of its novelty or its difficulties...."

Times are different now. But even today the demands on those who intend to make a career in the party are Leninist in their strictness. The main criteria that should be used in assessing candidates for party membership are their political position, real participation in perestroyka, attitude to work, and moral makeup. The party does not need mere extras with "good" qualifications but sincere and selfless people with a reputation for fighting for perestroyka. After all, Communists' profound conviction of the vitality and irreversibility of the course of society's revolutionary renewal, and their understanding of their personal responsibility for the success of the transformations under way are the guarantee not only of the maintenance but of the strengthening of the CPSU's leading role in the difficult socioeconomic and political situation both now and in the future.

Eradicating from the implementation of its goals the inertia and sluggishness inherited from the stagnation period, the party—albeit not without difficulty—is renewing its makeup and the style and methods of its activity. This is attracting to it progressively minded people who are prepared to share its concerns. Analysis of the new entrants shows that the overwhelming majority of people now joining the party are guided solely by their ideological convictions. Clearly realizing the difficulties that face them, they are tackling work in party organizations vigorously.

The experience accumulated by party organizations convinces us that an influx of fresh and healthy forces is felt more keenly in places where people are consistently and resolutely ridding themselves of unscrupulous and passive elements—all those who, for careerist or other selfish motives, have attached themselves to the CPSU or, getting into it by accident, have failed to realize over the years just what being a Communist means. The struggle for the purity of party ranks should be waged openly and publicly, sweeping away the hypocritical calls of the overly cautious that we should not wash our dirty linen in public. The purer the atmosphere in our party home becomes, the more attractive it will be to people, and the more prestigious its "owners." An exacting discussion about this is now under way during the report and election campaigns.

As working people's public and civic activeness increases, so the CPSU's social base is expanding. But we should not fail to take account of the fact that the unfavorable socioeconomic background, the slow resolution of pressing problems, and the substantial amount by which perestroyka in party organizations lags behind the process of politicizing society's life are having a definite affect on attitudes to the party. Nor can the increasingly frequent instances of party cards being voluntarily relinquished pass "unnoticed." However, this in no way justifies the position of certain party committees and primary organizations which, in their confusion, think longingly of the past instead of immediately analyzing the specific situations that arise—sometimes because of their own negligence—and working out businesslike rather than "paper" measures to improve the practice of admission to the CPSU and to enhance the vocation and importance of being a member of the Leninist party. The sometimes panicky complaints about a lack of "appropriate instructions" are also unjustified. Are there any grounds for such complaints? None whatsoever.

There were plenty of "appropriate instructions" in the past! Just look, for instance, at the CPSU Central Committee resolution adopted 2 years ago "On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of the Tashkent Oblast Party Organization With Regard to Admissions to the Party and the Consolidation of Party Ranks." This document outlined a program for overcoming the haste, lack of discrimination, secrecy, and enthusiasm for the notorious "quota system," percentages, and "gross" indicators in place of quality. Yes, it seems that in some places people thought that the Central Committee resolution applied only to those in Tashkent. Elsewhere people restricted themselves, as it were, to a one-shot flurry of memoranda and sessions. Worst of all, many party committees and primary organizations reacted in a highly distinctive way to the demands to eliminate numerical, formal approaches: They virtually stopped conducting ideological, educational, and organizational work with people—particularly workers—on selecting the most worthy of them for admission to the CPSU and training a reliable reserve for the future, and let work drift.

The candidate stage is highly important. But why, during the debate on the party now under way, has the wish been expressed to prolong this stage? It would seem, nonetheless, that it is not because 1 year is not enough to comprehensively check candidates, as certain people think. This year is not a real test for everyone—that's the problem! People forget to give candidates specific instructions, to listen to their reports, or to arrange training for young comrades in the principles of party building. In general a great deal of work with candidates should be seriously reviewed. In this respect the experiment, supported by the CPSU Central Committee, that has begun at the proposal of the Krasnoyarsk Kray party committee and the Vitebsk, Voronezh, Tashkent, and a number of other oblast party committees seems to be highly promising. Primary party organizations in these regions are being given the right to decide for themselves once and for all—without recourse to city and rayon party committees—questions of the admission or expulsion of candidate party members.... Where there is independence there is also responsibility! We must make it the norm to hold preliminary discussions in labor collectives on the statements by those who want to become Communists and ensure a strict individual approach to each of them.

We should not forget that the fate of perestroyka will largely depend on those who are currently joining the CPSU.

Zaykov Visits Moscow Schools on Knowledge Day

LD0109201189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 1 Sep 89

[Text] Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, visited a number of the capital's educational establishments. A solemn rally opened the new academic year at vocational school No 180. Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov congratulated the schoolchildren on Knowledge Day and wished them success in studies and labor. On the same day the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee congratulated participants in a traditional rally of 1st-year students at the Lomonosov

Moscow State University. A conversation with the rectorate, party committee members, and leaders of departments took place. They spoke about the present day of the main Soviet higher educational establishment and its problems. Comrade Zaykov took part in the festive opening of a baseball stadium, which the university had received as a gift from Tokai University of Japan.

Historian Backs Yakovlev View on German Pacts

PM0109123589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor V. Anfilov by correspondent Major Yu. Rubtsov: "World War II: Half a Century Later"—date and place not given]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Rubtsov] Demands to declare the Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact legally ineffective have been heard in the course of recent events in the Baltic republics. The following chain emerges: The secret protocol on spheres of interests (it is well known that the Baltic region was attached to the Soviet Union's sphere) leads to the treaties between the USSR and the Baltic states, which in turn leads to the documents on the entry of Soviet republics in the Baltic region in the USSR. If the secret protocol were to be abrogated, it follows that the subsequent documents should be declared ineffective. What is your attitude toward this line of thinking?

[Anfilov] Deducing territorial and other European realities that have emerged as a result of the war and postwar development from any treaties with Germany means either disregarding facts or deliberately misinterpreting them. This was declared with utmost certainty by A.N. Yakovlev in an interview with PRAVDA, and I fully share his opinion. Neither the treaty with Germany nor any protocol to this treaty actually determined the legal and political status of Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia. This status was determined as a result of subsequent events inside each of these countries.

Incidentally, I would like to draw attention to the opinion of Ingeborg Fleischhauer, an authoritative West German historian. "The Soviet Government," she wrote, "wanted to use the protocol primarily to obtain guarantees for the Baltic region from Germany." It is, after all, widely known that the "Weiss" Plan, which had been drawn up against Poland, envisaged—in the event of success—a shift of military operations to the Baltic countries and their incorporation into Germany. This must not be forgotten today by those who are loudly pontificating about Soviet "expansionism."

As regards the legal abrogation of the treaty with Germany, it was "abrogated" by the war itself. [passage omitted]

Contents of KOMMUNIST No 13 Reviewed

PM0509143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Published"]

[Text] The latest, 13th issue of the journal KOMMUNIST opens with the discussion article "Toward Socialism's New Aspect," prepared by editorial staffers in contact with scientists of the social sciences section of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The features of socialism's new aspect, which combine within themselves the ideas of Marx and Lenin, experience of Soviet history, the acquisitions of our friends in fraternal countries, values common to all mankind, and the principles of the new political thinking, are gradually taking shape as a theoretical concept in keeping with the high democratic and humanistic criteria of the modern epoch.

The section "Discussions" continues the discussion on the subject "Society's Renewal Is the Party's Renewal" and contains the article "Perestroyka: Are Variants Possible?" by L. Gordon and A. Nazimova. There is a varied selection of letters under the rubric "Toward the Central Committee Plenum. We Discuss the Draft CPSU Platform 'The Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Present Conditions.'"

"The Process of Economic Reforms and Its Catalysts" is the title of a joint study by the Soviet economist G. Zoteyev and the U.S. scientist E. Hewett.

A dialogue between party worker V. Churilov and ethics philosopher V. Bakshtanovskiy is devoted to the situation of moral choice.

Under the rubric "Man—Ideals, Interests, Values" there is a discussion of contemporary moral problems with the authors of the book "Origin of Spirituality"—the writer Yu. Vyazemskiy, the director P. Yershov, and Academician P. Simonov.

A review of readers' mail—"Returning to a 'Painful Subject'"—on legal and ethical questions of psychiatric aid is presented in the "Public Opinion" section.

"October 1964. Turn or Revolution?" is the title of Ye. Zubkova's polemical notes.

What is happening in Cambodia today?—the dispatch "Recovery" by S. Kolesnikov and Ye. Shashkov deals with this. Hun Sen, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the State of Cambodia, answers the journal's questions. I. Malashenko's article "The Country's Interests: Imaginary and Real" is also carried under the rubric "The Modern World: Trends and Contradictions."

Problems of State Reforms Viewed

LD0509163589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1040 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Excerpts] [Presenter] The 13th edition of the journal KOMMUNIST has come out. It begins with a discussion on the new image of socialism, prepared by KOMMUNISTS's editorial staff together with academics from the social sciences section of the country's Academy of Sciences. In a brief foreword, the authors note that they make no claim to describe in detail the image of the new society, but it seemed to me, after having carefully read this article, that the collective of authors, in summarizing theses previously presented, have nevertheless created quite an integral picture of the society to which we should aspire, which we should build. Replying to the question as to whether this is so is Eduard Arturovich (Rapagly), doctor of philosophical sciences and head of a department of the journal KOMMUNIST. [passage omitted]

[(Rapagly)] In this article, in particular, a special section, a very interesting one, substantive, very concrete, is devoted to the problems of state reforms. It is called "Society and The State." Under discussion is the division of power, and political pluralism, and the nature of the state, and the fact that the state should serve society and not suppress it. Society can only be democratic if there is a division of power. By tradition it is believed that there are three main branches: The legislature, the executive and the judiciary. Well, this is, of course, a tradition, and certainly there are other forms of division of power, and there are also other sources of power. We also have the party. A very complex question arises here, and not only a theoretical one, but also a practical one. How, in this division of power, can we grasp the role and the functions of the party. If we maintain the party's monopoly on power, political power, then the division of power will be of a formal rather than real nature. This is in the interests both of society and of the party itself, it is important to bear this in mind. The point here is not that the party is compelled to renounce power, that it is forced by someone to do this, the point is that the party itself has an interest in this, and only having renounced a whole number of its functions of power will the party be able to take a critical approach to what is happening in society.

[Presenter] Can you think off hand of an example of a voluntary renunciation of power?

[(Rapagly)] We are not speaking now of a total renunciation of power, but of a renunciation of a monopoly of power. Such examples can be cited, and plenty of them.

[Presenter] That is, you think that this is in principle quite feasible. But is not this regarding a renunciation of the role of, say, the political vanguard?

[(Rapagly)] Yes, of course, the readers of [illegible] have no [illegible] of [illegible], in fact, [illegible] [illegible] who might [illegible] [illegible] to replace the party in this regard. But much depends on what the party itself will be, what it will become. That is, if the party, thanks to tolerance of dissidence in its own ranks, thanks to democratization of its political structure, is able to permit pluralism in the ranks within the party, then it will thereby have no need to be apprehensive of any great challenge from outside. But if it starts becoming closed in some kind of narrow, dogmatic, ideological framework, at the same time imposing a very restricted possibility for initiative on the members of the party, and so on, then the party will encounter a challenge, certainly, a great challenge from the other public organizations, formal and informal.

New 'Topical Interviews' Program Described

LD0509083489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] One has to keep in mind that the Ministry of Railways has many problems. The interview that Railways Minister Nikolay Semenovich Konarev gave to political observer Aleksandr Tikhomirov will be devoted to what hampers the railwaymen in streamlining continuous transportation of cargoes and passengers. This conversation will be shown tomorrow, after the "Vremya" program, in the "Topical interview," a new program on central television. As you may have noticed by the previous editions, this show provides authoritative comments on the most burning current issues of concern to the broad public. How is the restructuring of the economic mechanism developing? Why has the pace of housing construction dropped? What is being done to prepare municipal services for the winter? What are the forecasts for creating food stocks? How should we curb price rises? These will be among the subjects of the next "topical interviews," in which party, state, government, and public figures, scientists, and specialists will take part. The "topical interview" editions have been conceived as yet another permanent feedback channel. We are expecting your questions, esteemed comrade viewers, and will try to provide you with competent clarifications and answers.

Economic

Belousov Outlines Defense Industry Conversion

PM0509124989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Aug 89 Second Edition pp 1, 4

[Interview with I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Military-Industrial Commission, by A. Pokrovskiy; no place or date of interview given: "Conversion: What Does It Mean?"]

[Text] [Pokrovskiy] Igor Sergeyevich, it has been known for a long time that in principle defense industry enterprises have for several decades now been supplying the national economy with the widest range of consumer goods, from pots and pans to complex medical apparatus. Until quite recently, however, the volume of this aspect of our defense industry's activity was not widely known. Could we begin our conversation with the relevant information?

[Belousov] Fine, I agree. And I would like to say this right away: Enterprises in industry's defense sectors not only manufactured various goods for cultural, consumer service, and national economic purposes but were also responsible for the supply and manufacture of individual categories of these goods in the country as a whole. For example, the USSR Ministry of the Defense Industry was responsible for supplying the population with cameras, enlargers, movie cameras, movie projectors, sporting and hunting weapons, binoculars, and camera lenses; the USSR Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry was responsible for boats and motor launches; the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry for cast aluminum ware; the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for samovars, primus stoves, automatic siphons, and sewing machines; and the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry for television sets, tape recorders, radio-cassette receivers, and radio receivers.

This list of nonfood consumer goods was considerably expanded in the last few years. The USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry has started manufacturing baby carriages and sleds; and the USSR Ministry of the Electronics Industry videotape recorders, video cameras, microelectronic calculators, electronic clocks and watches, and microwave ovens. The USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry has increased the manufacture of domestic radio and television equipment. Consequently, the ministries relating to the defense sectors of industry are already manufacturing one-fifth of all nonfood goods in the country (excluding light industrial output).

The defense complex' enterprises supply 100 percent of the all-Union output of television sets and domestic sewing machines, more than 97 percent of refrigerators and tape recorders, over one-half of motorcycles, and about 70 percent of vacuum cleaners and washing machines. It must be said, however, that these goods, which are in great demand by the population, are for the time being in short supply. I said "for the time being" because now, in the conditions of the conversion of military production, we have a real opportunity to increase their output in order to satisfy demand.

You might ask: When? I think that we will be able to relieve "tension" concerning most of the goods in question in the next 2-3 years, and even next year for some of them.

You mentioned medical equipment in your question. The defense industry complex has not lagged in this regard, either. But the output of medical equipment is totally inadequate. (Of course, that does not apply only to the defense industry complex.)

The defense industry complex ministries plan to manufacture medical equipment worth about R1 billion in 1989, and the draft plan for 1990 envisages the production of medical equipment worth R1.28 billion. The output of equipment to meet medicine's needs will increase during the 13th 5-Year Plan period. Consequently, the output of equipment will more than double by the end of the 5-year plan period and will reach R2.8 billion in 1995.

Many categories of output are being put into production for the first time. There will be considerable expansion in the manufacture of medical equipment which is so badly needed by our health care services. This includes kidney dialysis machines; anesthetic, respiratory, and x-ray machines; operating tables; lamps; bactericidal irradiators; compression chambers; sterilizers; pacemakers; and disposable syringes and needles.

Let me add that the Ministry of General Machine Building has pledged to organize the production of wheelchairs which will begin next year. This ministry is also involved in the manufacture of artificial limbs.

A lot must be done to ensure that we not only increase the output of medical equipment but also considerably improve its standards. The gap separating us from world standards here is very wide, even though there are quite a few items which meet and even exceed world standards. We are capable of doing a lot; the only point is that we must make more rational and more responsible use of the country's scientific and production potential.

[Pokrovskiy] It looks as if it is becoming a rule to unblock choke points by using the defense industry's potential.

[Belousov] We all are working on a common cause. For example, today we are facing the urgent question of more broadly involving the entire production, scientific, and technical potential in the solution of the food problem. Defense industry sectors can and must make their contribution to this work. The Military-Industrial Commission, jointly with the agro-industrial complex organizations, has elaborated a program for the development and assimilation of the series production of a system of highly efficient technological equipment for the processing industry.

Over an 8-year period the defense industry ministries must supply equipment and spare parts worth R3.7 billion. During this period the complex will have to develop 1,500 types of new equipment up to world standards. In order to ensure high standards in the equipment to be developed, 370 leading scientific research and design organizations in the defense industry have joined the [illegible] [illegible] and design bureaus.

Specifically, the Ministry of the Shipbuilding Industry will assimilate the manufacture of 912 items of equipment. They include mechanized flow lines for the production of dry livestock feed, and lines for the production of rice sticks and the packaging of cereals.

The Ministry of the Defense Industry will develop 596 items of equipment. They include an integrated unit for the primary processing of beef, for the processing and treatment of all types of pelts, a production line for edible animal fats in retail-size packaging, and an integrated unit for the processing of poultry.

The development of 718 items of equipment underlies the Ministry of General Machine Building's action program. They include automatic lines for pasta production, for the manufacture and packaging of semiprocessed meat products, and for the production of toilet soap, crackers, bread sticks, rusks, cakes, and fruit candies.

The list can be continued. But it must be mentioned that matters are still not progressing smoothly. We feel the effect of our development workers' lack of specialized knowledge in these problems. I do believe, however, that these are just temporary difficulties. Knowing the intellectual and technical potential of the enterprises involved, I am confident that the defense industry will fulfill the task it has been set.

We face similar problems in the solution of questions concerning the development and production of modern machine systems and technological equipment for the light and food industry and public catering.

The main defense industry plants are already getting involved in solving the entire package of tasks associated with bringing enterprises in the light and food industry, the processing sectors, and public catering up to modern technical standards during the 13th 5-Year Plan period, and their numbers will increase as work on the implementation of the conversion program progresses.

[Pokrovskiy] The following question suggests itself in this context. It is understandable that circumstances demanded the satisfaction of market demands for goods by utilizing all opportunities, including the defense industry's potential. But let us look at the economic aspect of the matter. It is generally believed that only a specialized enterprise is capable of manufacturing output of the highest quality with minimum costs of production. Is it not therefore disadvantageous to adapt, say, [illegible] a single shop [illegible] a major enterprise for the manufacture of output outside the enterprise's normal range? For example, [illegible] to bridge a gap in goods manufacture that has suddenly developed, but [illegible] Would it not be better [illegible] that this might [illegible] the appropriate sectors of industry? [illegible]

[illegible]

responding increasingly sharply to the economic parameters of certain areas of work. It is understandable that such interest and concern for savings should be displayed in this matter, too. This is very good. We must calculate more, we must analyze, we must refuse to adopt "willful" solutions.

Now—how do I phrase my answer to your question.

Let us begin with the fact that, as you are probably aware, the production of consumer goods ceased being "outside the normal range" of defense industry enterprises a long time ago. Virtually all enterprises in the complex are engaged in manufacturing consumer goods. This is also indicated by the fact that only two ministries within the defense industry complex will produce less than R1's worth of these goods per R1 of wages in 1990, while all the rest will exceed this proportion. The manufacture of [consumer] goods worth more than R1 per R1 of wages will be ensured in the complex as a whole, and will increase by a factor of more than 1.5 by the end of the 13th 5-Year Plan period.

Every enterprise has specialized in a certain field, and the bulk of consumer goods output at these plants is produced by autonomous shops, production units, and branches. Furthermore, this specialization takes into account the enterprise's normal range, technical equipment specifications, and cadre training, thus making it possible to ensure the manufacture of high-tech consumer goods.

Of course, in the case of mass manufacture of goods for the population, a production unit can be fitted with specialized equipment which is outside the main plant's normal range, as it were, but the plant's capacities are still used to provide the production unit.

Let us look at a specific example.

There is a specialized enterprise, the Minsk Refrigerator Plant, within the USSR Ministry of General Machine Building system. A good plant, I must say this. It produces 720,000 refrigerators a year. The Krasnoyarsk Refrigerator Plant, similar to it and approximately equal in terms of volume of manufactured output, is a component of one of the same ministry's production associations. It is actually this association that finds it easier to resolve questions concerning the setting up of refrigerator production, transportation and supplies, and introduction of technology developed for defense equipment purposes. Both plants' output is in great demand both at home and abroad.

When placing orders for consumer goods with defense industry enterprises, we count on already established enterprises, tried and tested in the performance of responsible tasks concerning the development of complex equipment. [illegible] organized and [illegible] which as a rule have a higher [illegible] for the assigned work.

To organize all this outside the defense industry plants would take many years. Note, furthermore, that the performance of these tasks invariably involves a quest for production reserves and a sense of personal involvement in the solution of acute social concerns such as satisfying the market's demand for consumer goods—another factor of considerable importance. Add to all this the partial release of production areas at defense plants as a result of conversion. There are many other reasons for making such a decision.

I am in favor of involving defense industry enterprises in consumer goods production, primarily the manufacture of high-tech products. As far as quality and production costs are concerned, I would not say that goods manufactured by defense industry plants are worse than the bulk of other goods. Rather the opposite. Production costs are determined primarily by highly technological production facilities and large-scale production. It is advantageous to produce goods in large quantities. This is a direct path toward reducing production costs and ensuring high profitability of production.

Our program for the development of consumer goods production takes this into account.

[Pokrovskiy] In the context of what you have just said, I would like to ask you another general question. Some people are under the impression that the defense industry is dominated by that selfsame administrative edict style which is now subject to so much scathing criticism. Meanwhile, these are our leading sectors in terms of the introduction of the latest equipment and technology or, as shown by statistical data, the most science-intensive. What is happening? Are people wrong in their impression about the edict style in these sectors, or are there some other factors at play?

[Belousov] It seems to me that the roots should be sought elsewhere. It is, after all, generally known that the administrative edict style was to be found not just in industry's defense sectors but throughout the national economy. I would not say that this style was hypertrophied in the defense industry compared with the civilian sectors. Yes, we were better organized and had higher standards of discipline. A whole series of defense industry sectors managed to create—thanks to efforts by the whole Soviet people—highly equipped production units, without which the country simply could not have existed.

Of course, industry's defense sectors have enough traditional strictness: There is a high degree of accountability for the fulfillment of clients' orders and for the standard and quality of performance, there is the military acceptance of output, and so on. Apart from these, however, the defense industry school has many other organizational features aimed at enhancing work efficiency.

Decisions to develop [o sozdanii] new military equipment are made following a thorough joint examination of the entire problem. Here we distinctly take into account the client's policy of enhancing the country's defense capability. The planning of development [razrabotka] and production is based on targeted programs covering both the long-term and 5-year-plan periods. This makes it possible to confidently determine the immediate and long-term actions of ministries, associations, enterprises, scientific research institutes, and design bureaus.

Another point: We have to really compete with our competitors abroad (and competition in defense work leaves no room for mistakes or indulgence). We also have competition within our own collectives, upholding [otstaivaya] the right to manufacture the most important systems and individual items of arms and military equipment. Moreover, we make constant use of functional cost analysis whose aim is to produce the highest possible effect at the lowest possible cost. We, jointly with our main client, are constantly solving the task of achieving maximum effect in defense capability within our allocated funds.

With a view to organizing modern and highly efficient production, we make broad use of technical experts' opinions, attaching major importance to general and chief designers who guide the solution of various important scientific and technical problems. Manufacturing enterprises are precisely identified right at the stage of technical (preliminary) planning. When it comes to ensuring high standards of design and technological development [razrabotka] of arms and military equipment, reducing the time taken for their development [sozdaniye], and assimilating series production, we believe that one of the main avenues involves making broad use of machine-aided design, of mathematical, half-scale, and full-scale modeling, and of other advanced design and test methods. We believe they should also involve manufacturing—primarily by the defense industry complex itself—highly productive technological equipment and objective systems for the measurement, technical diagnosis, and automatic quality control of parts, components, and finished products at all stages of their production and utilization.

The defense industry complex no longer enjoys any noticeable advantages over the machine building complex in terms of wages, the structure of fixed production assets, age makeup, or the technical condition of technological equipment. USSR State Planning Committee data show that the proportion of imported equipment in the machine building complex is even higher than in the defense industry complex. At the same time, we have a higher proportion of machines and equipment up to world standards thanks to their autonomous development and production by scientific research institutes, design bureaus, associations, and enterprises in the defense industry complex.

Serious attention has always been given to cadre training and the summing up and dissemination of front-ranking experience. It is no secret that our technical colleges and vocational and technical schools are, generally speaking, better supplied with equipment and teaching staff. We probably give more attention to the fitting out, rationalization, and certification of work positions at enterprises.

The system of standards for development and preparation of production was created and formerly operated only in the defense industry complex, covering virtually all organizational measures for ensuring output quality. Programs to ensure reliability were created at defense industry complex enterprises.

I think that elements of this organization would be useful in all sectors of industry.

Regarding the administrative edict method, the need for it cannot be looked at outside the conditions of the actual time, the actual level of the country's development, and the actual situation. There was a time when it conformed with the tasks set before the defense industry. It was simply necessary during the prewar period and during the war years. But the situation changed, both domestically and in terms of foreign policy, and the new political thinking made it possible to adopt a new approach toward the tasks which the defense industry must solve and toward the methods for solving these tasks.

There is no doubt that the country's economy could not have developed intensively on the basis of the administrative edict system. This is why the resolute demolition of the administrative edict system is one of the main components of perestroyka.

Does this apply to the defense industry? Yes, it does. I did, by the way, say so when I addressed the CPSU Central Committee plenum in 1987 and the Supreme Soviet session.

Of course, the defense industry does have its specific features and there is no getting away from them. But it is necessary to change the methods for the organization and management of science and production. The point is this: In 1995 the defense industry will deliver to the civilian economy 60 percent of its total produced output against 40 percent at present. This is why the time for transition from a primarily administrative edict method of management to a primarily economic method of management is drawing nearer for the defense industry.

[Pokrovskiy] In your opinion, what is it that prevents "civilian" sectors from utilizing the defense industry's experience in work organization and from introducing its scientific and technical achievements?

[Belousov] Before discussing the difficulties of introducing the defense industry's achievements in civilian sectors, one ought to take a look at the overall picture of the introduction of these achievements. This work has been going on since 1970, mainly through all-union, sectorial, and territorial media. I have specifically in mind the news bulletins containing necessary information about our scientific and technical achievements. Selection for publication is done mainly on the basis of new equipment which has already been introduced and for which working documentation is available. News bulletins cover a broad range of topics spreading along virtually all main avenues of technology and production (machine building, instrument building, radio and electronics industry, procurement production, new materials, and so on). Following a study of the bulletins, any interested enterprises request the appropriate documents either directly from the developers or through the scientific and technical information organs.

Thus we transfer up to 100,000 sets of documents to other sectors each year, but we unfortunately receive no feedback. The transfer of documents is essentially free of charge (the payments made cover only the costs of duplication), and there is virtually no data on its utilization. Consequently, it is difficult to compose an objective picture of the results from the utilization of scientific and technical achievements transferred from defense industry sectors.

What is the reason behind the inadequate utilization of achievements being passed on?

Any introduction of new equipment, especially equipment borrowed from someone else, requires the adaptation of documents to suit production conditions and the provision of any practical assistance that might be needed in its introduction. But the developers are not interested in this because any such activity means an additional load to their main production tasks, no incentives are provided for it, and no credit is gained from it.

The secrecy of the work being done was another considerable brake on the more efficient utilization of the defense industry's scientific and technical achievements. Times have changed now, and the greater openness (within reasonable bounds, of course) makes it possible to considerably enhance the efficiency of this work.

In a number of cases the technical standards at civilian enterprises prevent the reproduction of achievements suggested by our sectors. Therefore, the civilian sectors insist on receiving finished equipment, instruments, and so on which are adapted to suit their conditions, and this is not always possible.

And so, we have listed many shortcomings but they can be overcome. It is certainly necessary to utilize to the utmost the advantages of the new economic mechanism and to expand direct ties, contractual relations, and mutually advantageous production sharing.

It would also be worthwhile to review the procedure for the development and introduction of new equipment on the basis of the new economic mechanism's conditions. And this must be done promptly, since the expanding conversion and the review of basic principles of secrecy in favor of greater openness offer enterprises real conditions for broad exchange of scientific and technical achievements.

By way of an example, let me say that more than 600 modern technologies, new materials, and fully developed technical systems have been offered for utilization in the national economy as a result of the development of the "Energiya/Buran" space rocket system alone. The successful implementation of measures to introduce the space program's scientific and technical achievements will produce an economic effect of about R15 billion by the year 2000, and it will also make it possible to raise our industry's technical standards and the competitiveness of our equipment and goods.

[Pokrovskiy] The term "conversion" (which can be translated as "change" or "transformation" in Russian) is being more and more often applied to the defense industry. So what is changing in this sector, into what is it being transformed? Judging by the debates in the USSR Supreme Soviet, a number of deputies are already making solid claims to utilize the economic results of this process.

[Belousov] The active policy pursued by the party and the government, aimed at easing international tension, has enabled the Soviet state to embark on the reorientation of economic policy. Evidence of this can be seen in our country's announcement of a 14.2 percent reduction of its military budget and a 19.5 percent reduction of the production of arms and military equipment. This is what determines the start of the process of conversion—the switch of part of the defense industry's potential along peaceful tracks.

The main avenues in the national economy, whose development will primarily benefit from a reorientation of capacities released in the process of conversion, have also been defined—they are equipment for the agro-industrial complex, light industry, trade, and public catering and the production of consumer goods and medical equipment. In addition to that, we face the task of carrying out a huge package of work associated with implementing the country's information technology program. This means developing the electronics industry, computer technology, and communications systems.

Urgent solutions are needed for civil aviation questions, the transition to the manufacture of new, more economical, and more comfortable aircraft of the next generation—Il-96-300, Tu-204, Il-114, and others—and the satisfaction of Aeroflot's needs for such aircraft during the 13th 5-year-plan period. It is necessary to significantly increase the building of the civilian and fishing maritime fleets.

These are the 10 main avenues along which we have to work.

Of course, this does not rule out participation by industry's defense sectors in the solution of other national economic tasks. For example, it would hardly be possible to manage without the defense industry in developing high-speed ground passenger transport using the magnetic cushion principle or in developing gas-pumping components for gas pipelines and oil and gas extraction equipment. Other examples could also be cited.

The main point now is to distribute in the best possible way the production capacities that are being released as a result of cutbacks in the production of arms and military equipment. This is what ought to be resolved when elaborating the State Program for the Defense Industry's Conversion in 1991-1995 which will be submitted for examination by the end of 1989. The brunt of this work is now borne by the Military-Industrial Commission, the State Planning Committee, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the ministries of industry's defense sectors.

It would probably be worthwhile recalling that this is not the first time such work is being done in our country. The conversion process was also pursued in 1945-1947 and in 1961. Never before, however, has conversion been so highly important for the further easing of the international situation and for the expansion of possibilities to seek new constructive solutions in international affairs. Never before, when similar measures have been implemented, has attention focused so intently on Soviet man, on his needs, concerns, and aspirations.

Conversion is highly important for the solution of socio-economic questions in our country, for getting out of the complex situation in which the economy finds itself. The study of conversion experience in the last few years and the working out of questions associated with the drafting of the conversion program demonstrate the multifarious and complex nature of the technical, technological, cadre, financial, economic, social, and regional problems emerging here; but they all can be solved.

We shall have to prepare a package of proposals concerning the products list of military output whose production is due to be canceled and, on the other hand, the civilian output due to be assimilated at enterprises scheduled for conversion, the volume of capital investment needed by enterprises to implement conversion, and much else besides. Special attention must be given to ensuring social guarantees for those working at the enterprises.

Proposals have now been prepared for three plants scheduled for full conversion in line with the USSR proposals contained in M.S. Gorbachev's UN speech. They are the Yoshkar-Ola and Yuryuzan machine plants and the "Leninskaya Kuznitsa" Shipbuilding Plant. The experience gained in the course of elaborating the plans and the conversion itself will be taken into account when drawing up plans for the defense industry's further conversion. As a result of the cutbacks in arms and military equipment deliveries, many defense industry complex plants are already embarking on the process of so-called partial conversion.

Its overall results are as follows. The manufacture of military equipment by the complex in 1989 will amount to 95.5 percent of the 1988 volume (growth was set at 103.3 percent prior to conversion), while the production of civilian output will rise to 108.9 percent against 105.7 percent prior to conversion. This trend will be maintained in 1990 and the respective percentages will be 95.3 percent for the manufacture of military equipment and 113.1 percent for civilian output compared with the year before.

The capacities being released will be channeled into expanding the volume of civilian output being manufactured or into assimilating new output without the enterprise's full conversion. For example, as early as 1990 the Ministry of General Machine Building's "Polet" Production Association in Tomsk will manufacture automatic washing machines worth R100 million (against R64.9 million planned for 1989). Leningrad's "Bolshevik" Production Association will increase its manufacture of consumer goods to R50 million and will start manufacturing modern wheelchairs. The "Energiya" Production Association's experimental machines plant will increase the manufacture of food processors to R50 million as a result of the conversion of a unit being built for the production of military equipment. As a result of reducing the production of aircraft for the USSR Ministry of Defense, the Ulyanovsk aviation industry complex is preparing to manufacture the modern Tu-204 airliners, while the Tashkent aviation production association is preparing for the manufacture of new Il-114 aircraft for Aeroflot.

Naturally, the conversion of military production will result in reducing the volumes of scientific research work in the interests of the country's defense and the volume of such work for the national economy must be correspondingly increased. Primary attention in this process ought to be given to the development of complex science-intensive equipment.

In conclusion, I would like to note this: Conversion is by no means the simple process it might appear at times. In actual fact, cutbacks in the manufacture of various types of military output have a direct effect on operations by a large number of partner enterprises all along the technological chain, from raw materials extraction to machine manufacture. In other words, we are facing the question of our national economy's structure along a whole series of avenues. Here we need a precise and well-thought-out economic approach in order to obtain the maximum returns from conversion.

There is something else to be noted in this context. Conversion will make it possible to switch major capacities from the manufacture of military output to the manufacture of output for the national economy. It must be borne in mind, however, that these capacities are finite and can be accurately defined. These capacities are great but they are not infinite. It would be wrong to think that the defense industry's conversion will solve all the problems accumulated in the national economy. This is why, at the Supreme Soviet's first session, I identified 10 specific "sore spots" whose cure will be undertaken by the defense industry.

By solving these tasks, we will have done a lot for the country.

Management Blamed for Poor Rail Performance

18290268 Moscow GUDOK in Russian 24 Aug 89 p 1

[Article by V. Sluzhakov under the rubric: "On Themes of the Day": "In Whose Hands Are the Controls?"]

[Text] **For the 5th month in a row transport is not fulfilling the freight movement plan. This in a country where railroads have practically no competition from barge and truck transport. In a different context the customers would have long ago gone over to the competition.**

In the meantime the decline accelerates by the month. The August losses reached a record number—15 million tons of freight. The losses have not yet been recognized. In the hallways of the headquarters of the branch there is more frequent reminiscing about the crisis of 7 years ago. This was also discussed at a recent session of the Supreme Soviet but in a different connection. Having become the chief of transport, the present minister managed to rectify a dangerous turn in the discussion. This was one of the arguments leading to his confirmation at the second examination of his candidacy to enter the ranks of the new cabinet.

Why did the great difficulties arise again? Naturally, a primary cause was the strained conditions in a number of regions, which had an effect on transport, as well as the economic unbalancing caused by perestroyka.

Concern over the condition of the industry is shared in the government. It is understood that in this matter the railroaders are far from the first to be blamed. And radical measures will probably be taken. But we must not count on their coming soon. One way out is to turn to means under our own control. Judging by the figures heard at the meeting of the enlarged collegium of 21 August, this must be done. The question is how. During the last 3 and ½ years, over R24 billion were invested in the industry. New lines and alternate routes were built; sectors were electrified. This against the background of an increase in work stoppages, growth in operating expenses, worsening of financial indicators.

Irresponsibility, poor conscience, no punishment—these are determined to be the causes. These accusations primarily applied to management, whose income significantly increased with the changeover to the Belorussian method. Nevertheless, the style, methods, and functions of leadership, the level and competence of management, have long been crying for a renewal. The notorious vigils at the intercom are an example. Repeatedly, decisions were made: reduce, change.... Yet everything returns to its accustomed routine. Was anything gained?

Just one example dealing with the unloading of railroad cars. Financially, a number one item in view of the current, most severe deficit. Members of the Politburo and secretaries of the party Central Committee since upon a time considered it essential to apply themselves to it in detail. Staffs were created on the spot in party committees at the oblast and republic levels. That appears to have come to an end. Party organs are rebuilding themselves for political leadership.

Yet commanders of other roads, as before, seek supporters in party committees in order to influence the customers. Chief of the Volga line V. Chebotarev simply has not arrived at the idea that the oblast committees are walking away from the solution of this problem, while the soviets have not arrived yet. Being tied forever to the same collection of administrative measures is something the party is resolutely turning away from.

Yet one hears more and more often these days that command methods are natural to rail transport and are indispensable. There is no argument with that. But everything must have its limits, that's common sense. And if one cannot regulate relations with freight recipients on an economic basis, this deficit of deficits will not be eliminated. Present penalties for idling cars frighten nobody. A cheap asset is treated accordingly. One thing remains: to appeal to one's conscience and make threats on the intercom, inviting one of the deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers for support.

How, in this connection, can one fail to think of the empty car? Talk about it bored all to tears and made mouths sore. But this is really the basis for the realization of all the social programs earmarked in the Ministry of Railways and the trade union Central Committee in July and August after meeting in the headquarters of the industry with representatives of the workers' collectives. A minimum of R290 million will be demanded for the improvement of the railroaders' welfare. But financing difficulties have already appeared—there is no volume of shipments, even though the freight is there.

The chief of the Kemerovo line, T. Tuleyev, stated simply that the management system does not work. Eleven days of miners' strikes cost the railroaders R1.9 million of pay. The situation could be stabilized only through a normal level of shipments on the main line. But deception is in bloom. One-third of the cars coming in are unfit. The number of promises exceeds empty cars. All of this can lead to another strike. And then they'll come up with everything.

Every chief of a coal-carrying road could make similar statements and would be right. Therefore the carrying out of Ministry of Railways regulations long ago became almost a noteworthy event. But to cheat, to intercept a train or two with a shipment of empty cars became normal conduct.

To give credit where it's due, the Ministry of Railways introduced economic sanctions for nondelivery of cars in accordance with regulations. But again if something does not work out, there is no effect. In this case, as the specialists say, one must either go forward to deepened accountability, or retreat to previous positions.

Deputy Minister V. Nikiforov is sure that the process is irreversible. Dozens of depot collectives insist: Eliminate the supervision of road department managers who undermine accountability, taking profits from enterprises. This brings forth indignation and dissatisfaction. In a row of cases the collectives go to extremes in expressing their dissatisfaction, complicating the work of transportation. Items in GUDOK confirm this.

But more than just sympathy is awaited from the leaders of the staff of an industry. The Supreme Soviet session passed amendments to the law on government enterprises. They give a significant degree of economic freedom and right of choice to the collectives. However, to what extent they will be given to railroad enterprises remains unclear.

It is noted that strikes take place where collectives have not become masters of production with full rights and cannot influence the decisions that are being made. For the time being the controls are not in their hands. These days their demands and requests on any subject are transmitted to the center, and always to the chiefs of the branch of industry. The local chiefs contribute to this, too, by declining to make decisions which could be made on the spot.

Rail transport faces another serious trial. The situation is critical first of all in the area of management and organization. Fewer and fewer wish to not simply be railroaders, but citizens of the country with full rights. [sentence as published]

Agricultural

Nikonov Discusses Arrears in Saratov Oblast

18240236 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 27 Aug 89 p 3

[TASS report on visit of V.P. Nikonov, Politburo member, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Saratov Oblast on 23-25 August: "The Affair of Each and Every Person"]

[Text] Saratov, 25 Aug (TASS)—Grain harvesting is coming to an end on the fields of the oblast and a million tons more grain has been harvested than last year, but it is still too soon to start rejoicing. Many farms and also the oblast as a whole have failed to fulfill the state order for the sale of grain. And the Saratov workers' indebtedness to the Food Program is increasing from year to year while their southern neighbors are producing considerably more grain and of higher quality.

What are the reasons for the arrears of the oblast's agroindustrial complex? All other conditions being equal, why is it that economic levers of perestroyka are not working adequately on these farms? Leasing is being introduced poorly and the production of grain and feeds is not based on the achievements of science and the country's advanced practice. This was the subject of a businesslike and pointed discussion in Saratov Oblast during 23-25 August between V.P. Nikonov, a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and agricultural workers, scientists, and party and economic workers of the oblast.

The region has an immense natural, economic, and scientific potential, but it is not being fully utilized. Because of the underdeveloped science of farming there is a great deal of variation in the yields. On some farms underproductive fields can be found right next to ones that are producing a great deal. In a conversation with scientists of the Elita Povolzhya scientific production association, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee lodged serious complaints against them. The Institute of Grain Farming of the Southeast, which is known throughout the country, has lost much of its reputation for selection of the remarkable Saratov wheat. The scientific farming systems and complexes developed here are not very effective. On the experimental farms of the association the average grain yield over 30 years has been only 23 quintals, and on the kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] of the oblast—10 quintals. Today we need highly productive strains and hybrids of strong wheats, sunflowers, and feed crops that are resistant to droughts and diseases and we do not have them. It is time for our selection workers at the scientific research center to stop being oriented toward importing seeds from other regions as they are now.

The situation with the production of feeds on irrigated fields is somewhat better. The farms are providing 25-30 quintals of feed units per conventional head of cattle. But here, too, V.P. Nikonov noted when surveying the fields, the yield should be considerably more. Is it really possible to obtain 40-50 quintals of corn grain per hectare on irrigated fields? This mark is being missed by at least half. The yields of soy beans from irrigated land are not high and not enough peas, sun flowers, and rape are being produced. Therefore the animals' rations do not include enough protein and there is a large overexpenditure of feeds per unit of output. One gets the impression that both the scientists and the practical workers have lost their creativity.

In conversations with machine operators and specialists the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee recommended that they more boldly introduce new economic relations, especially long-term leasing of land. But they should not reject various other forms of ownership and production relations approved by the March (1989) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. It is necessary to give the peasant the right to free choice and then he will become the master not only of the land but also of his life in the country. Agriculture in the oblast has sustained immense losses because the kolkhozes and sovkhozes do not have their own industrial base for processing products of the fields and farms. It is now being arranged according to the principles of economic accountability [khozraschet] and integration. Who with whom? The industrial enterprises of Saratov with the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the oblast.

V.P. Nikonov visited Lysogroskiy Rayon where there are already large shops on the kolkhozes for processing meat and producing various kinds of sausages, preparing various confectionery items and sweets made from flour, and making cheese. And all this self-provision of food products was created on a contractual basis with their patrons—the industrial enterprises of the oblast center. The products from processing are used primarily to satisfy the needs of the population themselves and some of them are sent to city dwellers in keeping with agreements and state orders. The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee supported the initiative of the Saratov workers and the efforts of the CPSU oblast committee and oblast executive committee in this matter, and recommended that their experience in the organization of a small-scale food be disseminated everywhere.

Surpluses of milk and meat are being purchased from individual farms in the towns and villages and above-plan animal husbandry products are being turned over for processing. Real conditions are appearing for gradually saturating the market with food products.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee spoke at a meeting of the oblast party aktiv.

Nikonov Talks With Rural Leaseholders

PM0509152589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "To Be Masters of the Land"]

[Text] Questions of improving lease relations in the countryside were examined during the 2 September trip to Moscow Oblast's Naro-Fominskiy Rayon by V.P. Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. While in Subbotino village, he was briefed in detail on the results of work by the Simakov family leasing link.

Link leader V.P. Simakov said that they became leaseholders 18 months ago, having taken on 50 heifers from the farm. The state farm [sovkhoz] allocated them a new cow shed, a tractor, feed, and hay mowers. This year the leaseholders procured 100 tonnes of hay by themselves.

"Things are not going too badly," V.P. Simakov said. "We are familiar with everything—after all, my wife and I are both agronomists by education. We saw for ourselves how much can be done when you cease being the executor of someone else's will. This is the first time for years that working the land has given us the sense of being real masters, an interest in our labor's results. Even the leadership of 'Vereyskiy' Sovkhoz is showing interest, helping us in both major and minor matters."

Last year the leaseholders produced their own milk for the first time. That was when it occurred to them to build a cheese-producing shop next to their home, so as not to waste a single kilogram of milk. They chose a suitable shop plan with a capacity of 50 kg of cheese per shift, and brought in the equipment. Now it is up to the business

Following an inspection of the cheesemaking equipment, V.P. Nikonov dwelled on questions concerning the processing of agricultural products. He noted that there is a very urgent need to set up small shops for the processing of meat and milk on every farm. This type of processing enterprise will reduce to a minimum the loss of agricultural products and will make it possible to make the food on our tables richer and more varied. Especially since we already have experience in setting up small cheese dairies, particularly in Tambov Oblast. As for the equipment, it can be acquired with the foreign currency earned through the sale of above-plan grain production.

It must be noted, however, the CPSU Central Committee secretary emphasized, that leasing must not be perceived only as a means for enhancing labor productivity and boosting food production. Lease collectives are reviving the countryside, bringing meaningful life back to it. We are, moreover, talking about transferring land for long-term use so that it could be worked also by the leaseholders' children and grandchildren.

A meeting with leaseholder V.I. Gusenkov took place in Tyutchevo village. It was 3 years ago that he and his wife leased 50 cows. They also acquired three tractors and a set of hay gathering equipment. They installed an electric fence around their grazing land. The Gusenkov family milked 5,000 kg of milk from each cow last year. The sovkhoz milk yield, on the other hand, was 3,060 kg. The leaseholders' prime costs per quintal of milk were R4 lower, while their labor costs were 2-3 times lower than on the farm. The Gusenkov family produced output worth R45,000 per person, this being three times higher than on the sovkhoz. The annual earnings of each member of this family amounted to R10,000.

It is not just the high earnings that attract leaseholders. Freedom of management is the main incentive. The work by these collectives graphically proves how much more productive a sovkhoz worker can be, how much more sensible and thrifty he can be in dealing with land, equipment, and feed if he is given the right to autonomously organize his labor and deal with the produced output at his own discretion.

Leaseholders noted that their work is held back by the absence of prices for land and buildings. Agricultural equipment is too expensive. But prices of products remain the same. In this context, the participants in the meeting examined the question of pooling the leaseholders' efforts and resources and the need to set up raion-level outlets for the hire of agricultural equipment and implements.

In conclusion, V.P. Nikonov had a warm conversation with residents in one of the streets in Tyutchevo village. The CPSU Central Committee secretary asked about sovkhoz workers' living and working conditions and answered their questions.

V.P. Nikonov was accompanied by [illegible], USSR [illegible]; [illegible] the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Department; and A.T. Shamonin, secretary of the Moscow Oblast party committee.

Scientific

'Soyuz TM-8' Launched; Docking Set for 8 Sep

Flight Prospects, Activities Explained

LD0509224189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2200 GMT on 5 September broadcasts a 3-minute bulletin at the end of the "Panorama" program, on the flight of "Soyuz TM-8."

The "Panorama" anchorman, Nikolay Neych, invites Vladimir Bezyayev at the Flight Control Center to tell listeners about the prospects for the flight of "Soyuz TM-8," which is now flying above the Pacific Ocean. Cosmonaut Vladimir Titov, also at the Flight Control Center, explains what the cosmonauts are now going through, what they are experiencing and what tasks they are fulfilling during this period of adaptation to weightlessness.

Concluding the bulletin Bezyayev says that docking with the space station will take place on 8 September, again at night, at approximately 0400 in the morning, Moscow Time [0000 GMT 8 September]. There will be reportage on the docking, he adds.

Launching Announced

LD0509233289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2219 GMT 5 Sep 89

["A TASS Announcement"—TASS headline]

[Text] [no dateline received] In accordance with the space research program, the spacecraft "Soyuz TM-8", manned by a crew comprised of Colonel Aleksandr Stepanovich Viktorenko, the craft's commander, a Hero of the Soviet Union, and USSR pilot-cosmonaut; and Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Serebrov, the flight engineer, a Hero of the Soviet Union, and USSR pilot-cosmonaut; was launched in the Soviet Union at 0138 hours Moscow time on 6 September.

The flight program envisages the docking of the "Soyuz TM-8" craft with the orbital complex "Mir" and planned research and experiments on board it.

According to telemetric data, the craft's flight systems are functioning normally.

Cosmonauts Viktorenko and Serebrov are feeling fine.

The docking of the "Soyuz TM-8" craft with the "Mir" complex is planned for 8 September.

Cosmonauts' Program Outlined

LD0609093989 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 6 Sep 89

[Excerpt] Moscow September 6 TASS—The cosmonauts aboard the Soyuz TM-8 spacecraft, launched today, are expected to spend six months on the Soviet Mir station conducting experiments.

The cosmonauts, Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov, will work aboard the Mir complex with two modules—additional equipment (D) and technological (T) and ride a "space bicycle", called "Ikar", around the complex. The "bicycle" is provided with a safety line, though its autonomous energy system enables it to move in outer space independently.

The cosmonauts are expected to work for six months aboard the Mir station which will be for them not only a space laboratory but also "a home".

The Soviet orbital Mir station, which the spaceship Soyuz TM-8 is to link up with on September 8, has been in outer space since February 1986. The astrophysical "Kvant" module was added in April 1987.

The total weight of the Mir complex, together with the Soyuz-TM transport ship and the Progress freight automatic transport craft, exceeds 50 tonnes. It is 33 meters long. The "D" and "T" modules will be linked up with Mir in October 1989 and February 1990 respectively.

The "D" module has an air lock, an exit to open space and all the necessary equipment to work in it, including "the space bicycle". The module will have various additional equipment for the complex and also fuel, water and food stocks. It also boasts of a biological complex to test bird growing technology in conditions of weightlessness. Experiments on the production of super-pure semiconductor materials will be carried out in the "T" module. [passage omitted]

Military

General Speaks on Perestroyka in Military Sphere

LD0509184289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1125 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 5 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Viktor Chistyakov reports:

Restructuring of the USSR's policy in the military sphere, based on the principles of the new political thinking and defensive military doctrine, dictates the necessity for deep changes in the activity of the military academies. "The main aim of the perestroyka which is under way here is to ensure a new quality of training of cadres of political workers who will have to implement the radical changes in the theory and practice of military construction," Lieutenant General Anatoliy Sitnikov, head of the Political Department of the V.I. Lenin military-political academy, said today in a conversation with the TASS correspondent.

The graduates of the academy—future workers in the political organs of the Soviet Army and Navy, teachers of social sciences in military educational institutions, military journalists, sociologists and psychologists in troop units—today bear a great responsibility. Teachers and students now have the task of bringing the educational process as close as possible to solving those problems which face not only military collectives but also all Soviet people, General Sitnikov stressed. These are, primarily, the development and interpretation of the new Soviet military doctrine, as well as the implementation of the large reduction in the level of the Armed Forces and armaments, and giving them a nonoffensive structure. The tasks of strengthening law and order and discipline among the troops, the eradication of nonregulation relations and other negative phenomena and the improvement of interethnic education are topical ones.

It is planned radically to improve the link between the academy and troops. Anatoliy Sitnikov considers that the creation of educational troop complexes is a promising path in this direction; they would include branches of subfaculties, temporary research groups, consultative centers, experimental subunits and units.

In the opinion of the head of the Political Department of the academy, it is now necessary to work with people in essence in a new ideological situation in which there is active contact with the personnel, sound replies to emotive questions, and the ability to engage in dialogue. For example, leading military philosophers and psychologists today are studying the problems of informal youth associations and the corresponding lectures are included in the teaching plans.

Perestroyka in the Army and Navy has reached a phase of its development when practical organizational and educational work is becoming the decisive factor in making progress, General Sitnikov noted.

New Volga-Ural Military District Created

PM0509082589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by S. Mostovshchikov: "Ural Military District Abolished"]

[Text] The USSR Defense Ministry is continuing to cut the Armed Forces. The Ural Military District has been abolished as of 1 September 1989. The neighboring Volga Military District has been reorganized as the Volga-Ural Military District. It will be regarded as the rightful successor of the former Ural and Volga Districts.

We were told at the USSR Defense Ministry General Headquarters that the term "abolition" by no means signifies in this case the removal of troops from the Ural territory. It is a reduction of the district command by placing two large military formations under one "apparatus." In the future, the reduction of personnel and equipment numbers on the territory will take place in accordance with Defense Ministry plans and the proposals of the new Volga-Ural District command. In the meantime the number of official vehicles and other items of equipment that used to belong to military administrative personnel, of whom there will be fewer, is being reduced.

Colonel General Albert Mikhaylovich Makashov, former head of the Ural Military District, has been appointed commander of the new district.

One would add that that this is the second district abolition carried out by our Armed Forces. The first step was the elimination of the Central Asian District.

SOVETSKIY VOIN To Appear in 5 Languages

LD0509165789 Moscow World Service in English 0210 GMT 5 Sep 89

[Text] [Announcer] Perestroyka and glasnost are opening up ever new areas hitherto closed to the public. A new magazine about to come in the USSR is going to cover the situation in the Soviet Armed Forces. The magazine will be published in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese. Until recently the military magazine SOVETSKIY VOIN [SOVIET SOLDIER], published in Russian only, had many subjects to hush up. They were a closed zone; but now it seems the press is taking a new look. More from Editor-in-Chief Colonel Leonid Golovnyev:

[Golovnyev, speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation] We're often asked if it's true that this country is reducing its Armed Forces. We are an illustrated magazine that tries to prove with stills that this is really so. We send newsmen and photo reporters to places where troops are withdrawn and where they arrive. Our journalist recently photographed the loading of a Western Group's tank regiment and accompanied the tanks to the factory where they were re-melted.

[Announcer] Leonid Golovnyev has also mentioned a report on fighter bombers on the Soviet borders being replaced with interceptors now that the army is adopting a defense strategy. And one more report, he said, is devoted to Caroline Schofield, a British publisher currently working on an album to feature the Soviet Armed Forces. Bases of any kind were open to her. Now will the SOVETSKIY VOIN magazine, called the STAR in English, win acclaim in the West?

[Golovnyev, speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation] When we analyzed the letters from other countries a year ago we understood the time was ripe for making closer contacts with the foreign reader and we decided the reader would appreciate sensationalism, all the more so we had reprinted facts of this kind from foreign publications that had much to say about the Soviet Army's disciplinary battalions, deserters and draft dodgers. We feature clashing views in a debating club; some may disagree with the Soviet policy, others feel the army has grown obsolete and must give place to an army of militiamen or recruits.

[Announcer] And I only have to add that the STAR magazine will start coming out in English on 12 January.